

THE  
SATURDAY REVIEW  
OF  
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 882, Vol. 34.

September 21, 1872.

[Registered for  
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

THE AWARD.

THE Geneva Award is entitled not only to implicit acquiescence, but to the respect which belongs to a conscientious and intelligent verdict. The decision of the Arbitrators on the facts and on the damages incurred is conclusive; but the legal principles which they have propounded and applied will hereafter depend rather on their intrinsic merits than on the authority of a divided and non-professional Tribunal. If the Arbitrators had been a Court exercising full jurisdiction over international controversies, the Award would constitute a complete justification of the interpretation of public law which was steadily maintained by Lord RUSSELL, and which, notwithstanding the profuse concessions of succeeding Ministers, has been consistently affirmed by a small minority of English journalists. The moral justification of the conduct of the English Government during the American Civil War must depend exclusively on the legal rights of belligerents and neutrals as they existed at the time. A defendant in an action may, like the English Commissioners at Washington, acknowledge, if he thinks fit, a debt for which he was not previously liable; but if it becomes for any purpose material to ascertain his position before the commencement of the litigation, his voluntary confession can by no possibility affect the issue. But for the extraordinary and unprecedented submission of the English Commissioners to a retrospective code of laws invented for the occasion, the Award, if it has been accurately drawn, would have been on every point in favour of England. The Arbitrators unanimously determine as to the *Alabama*, not that the English Government violated any rule of international law which existed at the time, but that "Great Britain has in this case failed by omission to fulfil the duties prescribed in the first and third of the Rules established by the VIth Article of the Treaty of Washington." As to the *Florida*, a majority of the Arbitrators "is of opinion that Great Britain has in this case failed by omission to fulfil the duties prescribed in the first, in the second, and in the third of the Rules established by Article VI. of the Treaty of Washington." As to the *Shenandoah*, "by a majority of three to two voices, the Tribunal decides that Great Britain has failed by omission to fulfil the duties prescribed by the second and third of the Rules aforesaid, in the case of this same vessel from and after her entry into Hobson's Bay." Into these three alleged defaults the monstrous heap of American demand and vituperation has collapsed; and in all three the liability of England is expressly and exclusively deduced from the newfangled rules which were propounded at Washington for the express purpose of giving sanction to the American claims. If an umpire at cricket were to declare that a player was out according to the rules of football, he would discharge an analogous function to the duty which devolved on the Geneva Tribunal. The pretence that the new Rules express the doctrine of international law as it had been held in the United States is utterly unfounded. Not a trace of difference can be discovered between the judgments of English and of American Courts on the main principles of public law; and during the South American contests the Government of the United States refused to acknowledge any liability for the acts of cruisers equipped and armed for war in American ports, and often commanded by American citizens. Down to the commencement of the Civil War American politicians and jurists had been not unnaturally disposed to construe strictly the rights of belligerents, and to defend or enlarge the immunities of neutrals. When England acted on the same principles, the United States demanded damages to the amount of hundreds of millions sterling, and through the operation of the new Washington Rules, as understood by a

majority of the Arbitrators, the claimants have obtained the not inconsiderable sum of three millions and a quarter.

The majority of the Tribunal had the good sense to prevent a great injustice which might have resulted from the adroitness of the American Commissioners at Washington as it was exhibited at the expense of their simple English colleagues. When the claims for consequential damage were first launched, one of the most remote and indirect of all possible demands was ingeniously distinguished from the rest. The American Commissioners offered, on certain conditions, to waive the claim for the prolongation of the war; but they humorously assumed that the cost incurred by the American navy in pursuing or watching the Confederate cruisers was a part of the direct loss caused by their depredations. The *Alabama* claims which were then under discussion were confined to the alleged losses of American citizens, and the English Government had never consented to admit any liability to the Government of the United States; but the American negotiators were not mistaken in their estimate of the pliancy of the English Commissioners; and their audacious classification of the claims was allowed to pass without comment or protest. The offer to waive even a part of the claims was afterwards repudiated; but the English Government, in this case as in others, held itself bound by the virtual acquiescence of its agents. The indirect claim for naval expenses was accordingly submitted to the Arbitrators; but fortunately it only found favour with Mr. ADAMS and Mr. STAEMPLI. The imputations on the good faith of the English Government, and on the character of English statesmen, which formed so large a part of the American Case, are, as might have been expected, passed over in contemptuous silence. The brief summaries of reasons which are prefixed to the different heads of the Award are properly and strictly confined to the facts affecting the claims immediately under adjudication. There is no reason to suppose that the American counsel or agents will be seriously disturbed by a tacit rebuke which they cannot but have anticipated. Their abusive and ill-bred language was addressed, not to a judicial tribunal, but to the English nation, which they desired to affront in the hope of obtaining popular approval from their own countrymen. After doing their best, or their worst, to render future references to arbitration difficult or impossible, they have succeeded in their principal and practical object of obtaining a favourable verdict.

It is on the whole not to be regretted that the doctrines adopted by the Arbitrators are not binding as judicial precedents; and that, even as legal opinions, they will be almost entirely deprived of weight or authority by the dissent of Sir ALEXANDER COCKBURN. There is some obscurity in the proposition that "due diligence ought to be exercised by neutral Governments in exact proportion to the risks to which either of the belligerents may be exposed from a failure to fulfil the obligations of neutrality on their part." That the duty of any person or public body should vary with the magnitude of the damage which may result from omission is a doctrine unknown to municipal jurisprudence. A banker who has paid out the money of his customer on a forged order is primarily liable to the loss, though the circumstances may possibly exonerate him, as when the customer has facilitated the fraud by his own negligence; but it is wholly immaterial to the merits of the case whether the sum in dispute is 5*l.* or 50,000*l.* If the Arbitrators intend to speak not of the magnitude, but of the imminence or proximity of the risk, their language is ambiguous; and, to use a phrase of their own, such acts "cannot properly be made the subject of compensation, inasmuch as they depend in their nature upon future and uncertain contingencies." It is a clear, though a questionable, proposition that "the

"effects of a violation of neutrality committed by means of the construction, equipment, and armament of a vessel, are not done away with by any commission which the Government of the belligerent Power benefited by the violation of neutrality may afterwards have granted to that vessel"; but when the Arbitrators proceed to repeat the same statement in more general words, they create some doubt as to their meaning. "The ultimate step," they declare, "by which the offence is completed cannot be admissible as a ground for the absolution of the offender, nor can the consummation of his fraud become the means of establishing his innocence." As the offender in this case is the Government of England, it would seem that the Arbitrators have for a moment deviated from the judicial courtesy by which the award is generally distinguished. There is no question of fraud or of innocence, but of civil liability for an alleged omission. It was probably not argued by the English counsel that the commission given to the *Alabama* by the Confederate Government operated as a satisfaction for any default which might have previously occurred on the part of England. That the commission conferred a claim to the subsequent recognition of the character of the vessel as a ship of war is a contention which has perhaps been too lightly passed over by the Tribunal.

It is satisfactory, but not surprising, to find that the Arbitrators never condescend to notice the wrongheaded and passionate pretension of treating the Confederates as rebels, and of withholding from them the ordinary rights of belligerents. In the controversy occasioned by the Civil War, as in some other departments of human thought and action, rhetoric and metaphor have imperceptibly passed into dogmatic belief. The Americans, having been long accustomed for polemical purposes to denounce their adversaries as rebels and even as pirates, have finally been disposed to quarrel with foreigners for recognizing the fact that regular hostilities conducted on a vast scale, with varying success, between two great and organized political communities necessarily amounted to war. The framers of the American Case wrangled with childish pertinacity over the abusive terms which they applied to the Southern Confederacy; but they failed to attract the attention of the Arbitrators to their baseless contention. The QUEEN'S Proclamation of Neutrality, which was in fact wholly unconnected with the *Alabama* Claims, is happily not mentioned in the Award. There is perhaps some reason to suspect that the Tribunal may have been unconsciously influenced by the knowledge that one of the belligerents has, since the date of the transactions in dispute, passed out of political existence. If Germany or Russia had commissioned the *Alabama* or the *Florida* in a war against France or the United States, the duties of a neutral to the weaker as well as to the stronger of two contending maritime Powers might have been more carefully considered. "The privilege of extra-territoriality accorded to vessels of war" may possibly have been "admitted into the law of nations, not as an absolute right, but solely as a proceeding founded on the principle of courtesy and mutual deference between different nations"; but any great Power would imperatively claim from a neutral equal treatment with the adverse belligerent. If a German *Alabama* had been seized by the English Government during the late French war, reparation would have been strenuously demanded; and it would have been well if the dispute could have been settled by another Geneva Arbitration. A competent tribunal enunciating legal propositions of universal validity is not concerned with real or imaginary contingencies; but it is not disrespectful to the Geneva jury to assume that its verdict was adapted exclusively to the circumstances of the case submitted to its decision. One of the most doubtful of the rules which it has adopted regards the measure of damages, which had not been adequately discussed during the preliminary controversy. The Arbitrators seem to have taken for granted that all the consequences of a complicated set of causes were to be attributed to any particular act which might in their opinion have contributed to the result. Notwithstanding the judgment of the Tribunal, it by no means follows, even from the novel Rules of Washington, that a neutral, by the smallest omission or negligence, becomes the insurer of the mercantile navy of the injured belligerent. The Tribunal assumes that any oversight of a colonial custom-house officer at the Antipodes entitles those who may be injured by the acts of a cruiser which has received some irregular favour to be repaid in full by the Imperial Government. Fortunately loose generalizations of this kind are not likely to prevail in the Court of Queen's Bench.

#### THE WEST PRUSSIAN CENTENARY.

THE celebration of the hundredth anniversary of the partition of Poland by one of the partners in the enterprise might perhaps have been judiciously omitted. The story has been told from the German or Prussian point of view by the able Correspondent of the *Times* at Berlin. The apology would have been more complete if, after the lapse of a century, the indigenous inhabitants of West Prussia had been heartily reconciled to their rulers and to the dominant race. It happens not to suit the purpose of the Prussian writer to allege the best excuse for the annexation by referring to the map. A piece of Poland which thrust itself up to the shores of the Baltic between the Mark of Brandenburg and the outlying province of Prussia could only have been preserved to its former owners by superior force. It is comparatively useless to record the primeval migrations and conquests of Slavonic and Lithuanian tribes, or to prove that Poland in its more prosperous days may have been guilty of usurpation. FREDERICK the GREAT conspired with CATHERINE of Russia to dismember Poland, not in punishment of forgotten misdeeds, but because he wanted the province of Posen. When he had raised the minor kingdom which he inherited to the rank of one of the great Powers of Europe, he found it intolerable that an anarchical Republic or elective Monarchy should interpose a part of its territory between his Eastern and Western dominions. It is barely conceivable that Russian Poland may, in some future combination of circumstances, recover its independence, and Austria has more than once been willing to surrender Galicia for the purpose of establishing an independent kingdom of Poland as a check upon Russia. But, as long as Prussia retains her position at the head of Germany, it is impossible that the province of Posen or West Prussia should be surrendered to any neighbour. It is but fair to admit that the acquisition which was made for political and strategical reasons has been justified by improved administration. FREDERICK the GREAT exerted himself to raise the wretched condition of his new subjects, and his successors have governed all their dominions firmly, frugally, and justly. But for differences of religion it is probable that before this time the Prussian Poles would have identified themselves with the interests of Prussia. The local jealousy which is caused by the superior civilization and more successful industry of the German immigrants would in itself probably not be more serious than the harmless dislike which is felt in Wales towards English residents.

The connexion of Brandenburg with the provinces which bore the common name of Prussia was in the first instance purely dynastic. The first Grand Master of the German Order who became attached to the principles of the Reformation naturally proved his sincerity by converting his official and ecclesiastical sovereignty into an hereditary dukedom. The Order had long before conquered East Prussia, and converted its inhabitants to Christianity by persuasion or force; and the Prince of Hohenzollern who became Duke instead of Grand Master was content, like his predecessors, to acknowledge the feudal superiority of the Kings of Poland. When, on the extinction of the Prussian branch, the inheritance passed to the Electors of Brandenburg, the tie of nominal dependence became weaker and it finally disappeared. FREDERICK I., when he obtained the consent of the Emperor to his assumption of the kingly rank, was compelled to derive his title from the only territory which he possessed beyond the limits of the German Empire. His celebrated grandson, finding himself King of Prussia, naturally wished to include West Prussia in his dominions, more especially as it made a gap in a territory which was otherwise wanting in compactness. The excuses which were at the time assigned for the partition of Poland were nearly the same which are alleged by native and foreign apologists for the designs of Russia on Turkey. The constitution of Poland was obsolete and impracticable, and the condition of the inhabitants was miserable; but the Government and the nobility were fully aware of the necessity of organic reforms, and they were prepared to make the necessary sacrifices for the improvement of the country. All the measures which they proposed for the purpose were defeated or rendered abortive by the intrigues and dictation of the Empress CATHERINE, who acted in the closest concert with FREDERICK the GREAT. The conquest was a triumph of hypocritical violence; but FREDERICK, at least when he attained his object, practically acknowledged his responsibility for the good government of his new province. Personal serfage was abolished in Prussian Poland many years before the discontinuance of the system in the more backward parts of Germany.

Although the Polish subjects of Prussia have been exempt



from the oppressions suffered by their kinsmen and neighbours in the Russian provinces, they have sympathized with the efforts of the Russian Poles to recover their independence, while the Prussian Government has on its part uniformly afforded all the aid in its power to the Russian authorities. The progress of the German language has been slow and intermittent, although Poland is destitute of literary cultivation. The Prussian administrators have, with less than their usual vigilance and energy, allowed the control of primary education to remain in the hands of the native Catholic clergy, who are equally anxious to preserve the purity of the faith and to maintain their own influence over their countrymen. German is the language of heresy and innovation, while it is certain that a Polish peasantry will be strictly orthodox. The aristocracy perhaps care less for the interests of religion; but they are jealous of the influence of Prussian officials. Since the establishment of Parliamentary institutions in Prussia, the Polish members have been almost uniformly in opposition; and although their discontent probably falls short of disaffection, they have always affected to maintain a distinct national character. The predominating influence of the Crown renders Parliamentary opposition less formidable in Prussia than in countries which approach more nearly to the form and spirit of the English Constitution; but even in the Assemblies of Berlin the attitude of the Poles has often been found embarrassing. The rupture between the German Government and the Roman Catholic hierarchy increases, as might be expected, the antagonism of the Polish clergy and laity. It is difficult to understand the policy of Prince BISMARCK in precipitating a conflict which unites against the Imperial Government all the enemies of German unity. The bishops of Germany will sympathize with every form of resistance which the clergy in Prussian Poland can offer to the Government. More especially they will favour the claim of the Church to control primary education, although in different circumstances they might probably prefer German culture to Polish isolation. The supremacy of the Church is always preferred to temporal welfare, where material advantages come into collision with the principles of orthodoxy. If the English Government were to adopt any course which was unpalatable to the Dissenters, the whole Nonconformist community would unanimously oppose any attempt to extirpate the Welsh language.

The celebration of the union of West Prussia with the monarchy will not excite unanimous enthusiasm; but it is apparently intended to remind the inhabitants of the province of the benefits which they owe to German influence and to Prussian administration. The Poles under Prussian rule may at least congratulate themselves on the geographical position which secured them from incorporation with Russia. Though their national customs and language may not be encouraged by their rulers, they share the solicitude of an intelligent Government which never willingly tolerates oppression or abuse. The sympathies of race and language, which have in modern times created the political unity of Germany and Italy, have frequently been overborne by the influence of custom, and by considerations of practical convenience. German residents in the Baltic provinces are not disaffected to Russia as long as they are exempt from vexatious interference. The people of Alsace and of German Lorraine deeply regret their separation from an alien nation and Government; and it has never been doubted that the Norman French of the Channel Islands are heartily loyal to England. The agitation which ended in the retirement of the English Government from the burdensome protectorate of the Ionian Islands was artificial and factitious; nor could it have arisen if the little kingdom of Greece had not presented an object for the real or spurious patriotism of the islanders. The malcontents of Posen have no kingdom or republic in their neighbourhood to which, if they were detached from the Prussian monarchy, they could transfer their allegiance. The impossibility of liberating Russian Poland is now universally recognized; and there has never been a question of uniting Posen with Galicia. It is probable that before a second century after the partition has elapsed the inhabitants of Western Prussia will have become German in language, customs, and in feeling. Whatever is wanting to the completeness of the present festival may be supplied by prophetic anticipation.

#### POLITICS IN SEPTEMBER.

**N**EXT to Christmas week, September is for the most part the dulllest period of the political year. Members of Parliament have had time to cool down from the excitement of the

past Session, and the end of their holiday is still too far off to give them much interest in the Session to come. Besides its own special dullness, the September of this year is influenced by the causes which promise to make the present recess more than usually uneventful. The state of parties disposes both Liberals and Conservatives to keep as silent as they can. The Conservatives see office nearer to them than it once was, and they are naturally careful not to hold out hopes which can never become realities. Their frequent asseverations that the Ministry only hold office until the Conservatives find it convenient to relieve them of it make it difficult for them to say much about Mr. GLADSTONE's revolutionary violence, since to do so would lay them open to the charge of consulting their party interests at the expense of the institutions of the country. The Government has disposed of so much of its original programme as can be discounted by Liberal members not in the secrets of the Cabinet. When a Land Bill or an Education Bill was due for the coming year, a subject for safe generalities lay always ready to hand. Their place is now supplied by the promised Bill about local taxation; but local taxation is a thorny subject, and, as Sir MASSEY LOPES has found by this time, safe generalities by no means abound in its neighbourhood. The Duke of RUTLAND probably thought that he had discovered one when he told the Derby agriculturists that what they wanted was that the burden of local taxation should not be taken off the occupier and put on the owner, but taken off altogether. No more revolutionary suggestion has ever been made in England. There is something terrible in hearing a Duke calmly propose that all taxation shall become Imperial, and, as a necessary consequence, that the whole local administration shall be transferred to the Central Government. The only explanation is that, by some wild access of ill-regulated passion, the Duke of RUTLAND has become enamoured of the office of a French Prefect, and burns to hold a post under the Local Government Board.

Mr. HUGHES appears to be extraordinarily unpopular with a section of his constituents because of his opinions on Co-operative Societies and on the question of Disestablishment. Nothing can be better calculated to reconcile us to the transfer of political power to the working classes than the spectacle of tyranny in will, though not in deed, which has lately been presented by some of the retail shopkeepers. Their sole idea apparently of prospering in their trade is to prohibit people from buying except through their agency. The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER has again and again been pressed to spy into the use to which Civil servants put their time after office hours; and the other day the Directors of the Bank of England were asked by a proprietor to prohibit their clerks from becoming members of Co-operative Associations. No Trade Union was ever so unreasonable as this. They at least content themselves with dictating the terms on which their own members shall sell their labour, but the shopkeepers assume a right to dictate to the community at large where they shall go to buy their goods. If the Radicals of Frome insist that their representative shall be in accord with them, not only upon questions of practical moment, but upon every question that may become of moment at some future time, they will find their range of choice uncomfortably narrowed. Somewhat less than a third of the existing Liberal members think with Mr. MIALL. No effort on the part of the opponents of the Established Church can at present convert this minority into a majority, and until there is some reasonable prospect of doing this, it seems a pity to ostracize useful members of Parliament because they are not warm partisans of an ecclesiastical revolution which, under the most favourable circumstances, must take some years to bring about. Mr. WINTERBOTHAM appears to have been blamed, not so much for his conduct in office as for the fact that he took office. It is not wonderful perhaps that the Dissenters of Stroud should have felt some soreness when the most prominent leader of the agitation against the Denominational liberty afforded by the Education Act became a member of the Administration which passed it. But if no rising politician were to take office until he had found a Ministry with which he was in accord upon all points, the Government of the country would soon come to a stand. The most strenuous opponent of the 25th Clause might still believe that the Bill as it stood was the best Bill that could be passed under the circumstances, and that it was infinitely better than no Bill at all. A conviction of this kind is an ample justification for such seeming sacrifice of consistency as that of which Mr. WINTERBOTHAM was guilty.

Mr. LOWE's speech at Anstruther differs from most of those which help to fill the newspapers at this season in that it contained something which, while pertinent both to the time

and the audience, yet admits of a wider application. A new educational system has just been started in Scotland, and a great many fears have been expressed lest its operation should prove hurtful to the quality of the education hitherto given in elementary schools. The easiest way of meeting this objection before a Scottish audience is to give it a flat denial, and, by the help of some plausible reasoning and some judicious flattery, Mr. LOWE might easily have convinced the people of Anstruther that the effect of the Scotch Education Bill had been misunderstood. Instead of this, he told them frankly that, in so far as attention to the quality of the education in elementary schools interfered with attention to the quantity, the quality must give way. "The primary object of a State education, supported in part by State funds and administered by public bodies, is the 'education of the poor.'" In theory everybody admits this. But then it is said, why should not the poor receive instruction so long as they remain at school in higher as well as in elementary subjects? The answer to this is twofold. In the first place, in the very short time which the labouring classes have to give to education it is impossible for any but the cleverest children both to master the rudiments and to use them. In the second place, the teacher will naturally feel a keener interest in the clever children who are studying something more than reading, writing, and arithmetic, than in the dull children who have no chance of getting beyond a routine so unavoidably wearisome to a schoolmaster. Where the teacher's interest is there will his attention be also. Unless there is some strong external motive supplied to him for looking after the laggards of his flock, he will almost to a certainty neglect them while he is pressing forward with the foremost. It was the great merit of the Revised Code that it created this external motive. It is the fashion with some educational reformers to say that the Revised Code has done injury to elementary schools. If so, it has injured them in the sense that a pruning-knife may be said to injure a tree when it shortens the too luxuriant shoots and secures that there shall be foliage on the lower branches as well as on the upper. Mr. LOWE could say nothing new about the action of the Revised Code, but what he did say was so much to the point that it is worth while quoting it. The Revised Code forces schoolmasters "to do exactly what they don't like—that is, to give their time mainly to the more backward and 'more stupid children instead of to those who are more forward' and promising. It was meant to do that, and it did. It 'was meant to make the education for which the poor contribute an education for the poor in the first instance, and 'it was only meant that those more forward pupils should 'receive any extra benefit after the poor had been sufficiently 'provided for.'" This is a lesson that especially needs to be kept before the minds of Scotchmen, because they are likely to be blinded to it by the successes of an opposite system. Elementary schools in Scotland, unlike elementary schools in England, have been the nursery of many distinguished scholars, and the zeal for knowledge which is so honourable a distinction of Scottish parents has often led them to make immense sacrifices to secure to their children the further educational advantages for which a few well employed years in an elementary school have served as a preparation. Scotchmen are naturally alarmed at any change which threatens the continuance of a system which has borne such good fruit. But the first duty of the State is not to turn out a few scholars, but to see that no child is without such a minimum of education as shall enable him to earn an honest livelihood. When this has been secured, there need be no limit to the zeal of the community in distributing opportunities for higher education as widely as possible. But until this has been secured, it is sometimes necessary to check popular zeal in this direction. Or rather it is desirable to divert it into another direction; to stimulate it to do for the higher education, by means of voluntary effort and of endowments turned to better account, the service that may hitherto have been done for it out of funds which ought in the first instance to be reserved for purely elementary instruction. This, it is hoped, is what the Scotch Education Act will effect; while, on the other hand, England may be a gainer by watching how Scotch managers contrive to reconcile the conflicting demands on them, and to help those exceptional children who repay all the trouble that can be bestowed on them without neglecting those commonplace children who so rarely reward the attention to which they have still a paramount claim.

## THE ST. BARTHOLOMEW CONTROVERSY.

THE interest of newspaper readers in the dull time of the year is aroused and maintained in accordance with an odd law of succession. There is always something to discuss; but a week before it is often impossible to anticipate the next subject of remark. Just before the EMPERORS were dispersing from Berlin, and when the International, to the general satisfaction of Europe, had removed its headquarters to New York, it happily occurred to Dean STANLEY that three hundred years had elapsed since the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. No fitter topic could be selected by an Anglican dignitary of liberal sentiments who had undertaken to address a Presbyterian congregation in Scotland. If the audience hoped to be enlivened by appeals to their hereditary dislike of Popery, they were deservedly disappointed. It would not be consistent with Dean STANLEY's character to teach the duty of hating Roman Catholics because Charles IX. and his accomplices long since murdered thousands of French Protestants in the hope of extirpating the entire community. It was more to the purpose to dilate on the change of feeling and opinion which has, it may be hoped, now rendered the repetition of similar atrocities on the same pretexts impossible. The bloodthirsty doctrines and practices of CATHERINE of MEDICI and of the House of Lorraine are represented in the present day, not by Catholics or Protestants, but by the Communists of Paris, and by the leaders of the International Association. The Jacobins of the first Revolution displayed many of the characteristics of a fanatical sect, and more especially the passionate love of slaughter by which minds of a certain class endeavour to satisfy themselves that their own convictions are sound and sincere. The Paris Commune and its apologists found in the conflagration of the Tuileries and in the murder of the hostages a pledge to themselves that they were in earnest. The ruffians who have escaped, and those who have been punished for their share in the crimes of 1871, represent with sufficient fidelity the assassins of COLIGNY; and GREGORY XIII., whose alleged complicity in the massacre has been lately under discussion, may be more legitimately compared to Dr. KARL MARX than to PIUS IX. It is not known whether the present POPE would be sufficiently logical to applaud a wholesale murder committed for the benefit of the Church. The International Society has in the present day more earnest and more consistent supporters than the Church of Rome; and enthusiasm must attain a certain height before it can supersede natural feeling and moral scruples. The Holy City of Paris, as it is denominated by imaginative eulogists, may claim the proud distinction of having produced in different ages the murderers of St. Bartholomew, the murderers of the September prisons, and the murderers who slew the Archbishop of PARIS and his companions. The dithyrambs of VICTOR HUGO and his imitators are sustained and justified by a true perception of historic continuity. Ultramontane, Republican, or Atheistic, the rabble of Paris in all ages is ready to express its convictions in the graphic language of conflagration and slaughter.

Dean STANLEY naturally sought to draw a doctrinal or ecclesiastical inference from the St. Bartholomew massacre. There was not much to be said about the diabolical woman who instigated her half crazy son to shoot down unoffending subjects from the windows of his palace. It might indeed have been contended that CATHERINE and GUISE himself might have shrunk from their scheme of wholesale murder if they had not been encouraged by the certainty that their acts would be approved by their spiritual guides. GUISE's brother, the Cardinal of LORRAINE, was himself a Prince of the Church; and it was not for the laity to be more scrupulous than the hierarchy. Modern experience shows that, although absolution after crime may be pleasant, it is not an indispensable luxury. The assassins of Paris in 1793 and in 1871 needed no priests to assure them that in outraging humanity they were rendering service to heaven. There fortunately remained a controversial application of the events of 1572. The POPE having lately become infallible, it seemed an interesting question how far his St. Bartholomew predecessor had sanctioned the murder of the Huguenots. The transaction is so repugnant to modern feeling that a certain doubt might be thought to attach to an infallibility which associated itself with the doings of CATHERINE of MEDICI. Some of the more thoroughgoing proselytes to Romanism have a robust appetite for moral paradoxes which would digest even the St. Bartholomew massacre if it were administered to them by infallibilist hands; but Dean STANLEY could not fail to create a certain uneasiness in the minds of ordinary Roman Catholics by recalling the proofs of the sympathy and approbation which was elicited by the crime



from the highest authority of Rome. Medals were struck at Rome with the effigy of the POPE on one side, and with inscriptions on the other commemorating the massacre; and it is certain that the crime was not visited with any formal censure. Priests and priest-ridden laymen in the present day never mention the King of ITALY without a contemptuous reference to the excommunication which he is supposed to have incurred; but neither CHARLES IX. nor his mother was ever judicially excluded from the fold of the Church. It was not until HENRY III. had quarrelled with the GUISES, and allied himself in spite of his own grovelling superstition with the Protestant King of NAVARRE, that a Dominican monk, expressing the judgment of his Order and the spirit of his Church, consecrated the dagger which JACQUES CLÉMENT was about to thrust into the body of the KING. If, therefore, GREGORY XIII. approved of the massacre, it might appear to those who consider the act to have been criminal, that he must have fallen into a moral, and perhaps a theological, blunder; but infallible personages are by the force of the term exempt from error, and therefore it is inferred by heretical controversialists that one Pope was not infallible, and that accordingly infallibility cannot be predicated of the Popes as a body. The demonstration is rather curious than practically important, because DEAN STANLEY and his audience never for a moment dreamed that any Pope was infallible; and they are no more surprised to learn that a POPE in the sixteenth century approved of a religious massacre than that a Communistic Jacobin in the present day exercises analogous toleration for the crimes of his own faction. It was also certain that the Roman Catholics would neither acknowledge their defeat nor suffer themselves to be driven into a logical corner. The DEAN of WESTMINSTER may probably have intended rather to provoke an animated and amusing discussion than to involve his antagonists in confusion.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER, who belongs to the strictest sect of orthodox adherents of the POPE, was as usual ready to engage in the controversy. With unexpected liberality he condemned the murder of seventy thousand of the best Frenchmen of the time, although they were involved in the guilt of religious nonconformity. His business was not to justify the eccentricities of CHARLES IX. or of the GUISES, but to show that it was immaterial whether the Pope of the time was or was not an accessory after the fact to the murder. It is well known that the supremacy of the Pope extends only over issues of faith and morals; and it is for the same authority to define, like DANIEL, not only the interpretation of the dream, but the dream itself. GREGORY XIII. seems to have expressed unqualified approval of the massacre; but neither he nor any of his successors have solemnly declared that the question involved was one of faith and morals. The Pope is infallible only when he speaks from his chair in the plenary exercise of his miraculous powers. When a Pope affirmed in a Bull that certain propositions attributed to JANSSEN were heretical, it was not disputed that he was speaking infallibly, except that JANSSEN had never said anything of the kind; but it was afterwards declared to be heretical to dispute the fact that JANSSEN had published the obnoxious opinions; and in the successive decrees and censures which were fulminated against the Jansenists the POPE was acting in his infallible character. Until PIUS IX. or his successors declare that the merits of the St. Bartholomew massacre are to be accepted as of faith, SIR GEORGE BOWYER may confidently assert that the human judgment of GREGORY XIII. was not necessarily exempt from error. LORD DENBIGH and DR. NEWMAN himself take substantially the same ground of defence with SIR GEORGE BOWYER; and DR. NEWMAN adds that no Pope can convert wrong into right, and that he is not satisfied of the fact that GREGORY XIII. approved of the massacre. He also explains that infallibility is not impeccability; and that CAIAPHAS, who is not regarded as a perfect character, nevertheless prophesied. To Protestants there is something revolting in the necessity of accepting even the message of inspiration from CAIAPHAS, or from ALEXANDER VI. If an infallible Pope may possibly be a villain, he approaches too nearly to the character of an Indian or African idol for controversial purposes. DR. NEWMAN'S implied admission may perhaps be acceptable to zealous enemies of Rome. An absolute power to define faith and morals, which may possibly be combined with false opinions and with ethical depravity, may perhaps be theoretically conceivable, but it is not calculated to attract proselytes by any congeniality with popular feeling. It was never alleged that PIUS IX. claimed for himself or for his predecessors the power of converting right into wrong. It follows from the doctrine of infallibility, that if

the St. Bartholomew massacre were declared *ex cathedra* to have been right, it would not previously or originally have been wrong. For a newspaper episode in the barren month of September, the discussion possesses more than average merit.

#### THE PROPOSED COMMERCIAL TREATY.

M. THIERS has shown on more than one occasion that he is not too old to learn, and even his economical theories seem not to be unaffected by this most valuable faculty. He has told the municipality of Havre that he does not wish to destroy Free-trade, and, considering how ardently he has wished to destroy it down to a very late period, this is a declaration of some importance. There may be some significance, too, in the fact that it was made in Normandy, the province where Protectionist opinions are commonly supposed to be strongest. Under the system of Commercial Treaties Free-trade has made steady progress in the affections of the French nation, and M. THIERS has perhaps found out that he has fewer supporters than he thought even in the district where he had expected to have most. It is hard to make people Protectionists against their will, and if even within fifty miles of the cotton-mills of Rouen the PRESIDENT has to disclaim hostility to Free-trade, he may think with some reason that it is time to give up the attempt.

The particular shape which M. THIERS'S repentance has taken is that of a desire to negotiate a new Commercial Treaty with England. He sees that England will not lend herself to the restoration of protective duties in France, and that if the French Government is bent upon restoring them, it can only do so by leaving the Treaty to its fate. If the Assembly had lent itself more heartily to M. THIERS'S views, he might possibly have accepted this necessity. It must be supposed that by some strange process of thought he has convinced himself that the prosperity of France would be increased by diminishing her commerce. But he has not been able to bring the Assembly round to his opinion, and the consequence is that his scheme of imposing a duty on raw materials, and corresponding duties on imports, has been lamentably shorn of its original proportions. But if it is impossible to secure Protection in its integrity, M. THIERS may think that it is not worth while to secure a fragment of it at the cost of embarrassing the relations of France with the countries to which, for some years to come, she must continue to be bound by obligations identical with those from which she will shortly be freed as regards England. Now that the duty on raw materials has been so reduced by the Assembly, may it not be worth while to make a merit of reducing the duties on English manufactured goods to a corresponding extent, and to ask the English Government to make this correspondence the basis of a revised Treaty? M. MICHEL CHEVALIER has shown that for some years after the expiration of the Treaty of Commerce with England the practical result of the change as regards France will be exceedingly small. By the treaties with Switzerland and Germany which still remain in force the French authorities are not entitled to inquire into the origin of goods imported from those countries. The consequence will be that English goods will enter France as before, only they will enter by way of the Swiss and German frontiers, instead of by Havre or Bordeaux. The prospect, therefore, which lies before M. THIERS is something of this sort:—Under no circumstances can any immediate good follow from the denunciation of the Treaty with England; while, owing to the unwillingness of the Assembly to impose an adequate tax upon raw materials, the good that may ultimately follow is almost infinitesimal. And though English goods will not be placed at much real disadvantage as compared with German goods, they will be placed at a great apparent disadvantage. France has not so many friends just now that she need be anxious to alienate England, even though England neither has given nor is likely to give her anything but good wishes. These considerations have probably combined to suggest to M. THIERS the propriety of reopening negotiations with the English Government, and the account of these negotiations given by the Correspondents of the *Times* may be taken as substantially correct. The gist of this account is that the French Government has formally disclaimed all intention of re-establishing Protection, and has declared that the modifications it proposes in the existing Treaty are only intended to put the French manufacturer in as good a position as the English manufacturer. The necessities of the Budget have left the Government no option but to impose a duty on raw materials, and the object of the duties which it is about to

lay upon imports is simply to ensure that the French manufacturer shall not be undersold by his English rival as a consequence not of any natural advantage possessed by the latter, but of the act of the French Government. The import duties are to correspond exactly with the duties imposed on raw materials, and it is further proposed that, if at any time either nation shall wish to modify the tariff as regards any particular article, such modification shall not affect any other article, still less invalidate the Treaty. Even to this limited extent no modification is to take place without due notice, and after the expiration of a period to be fixed by mutual consent. It also appears that the French Government have given assurances that they have no intention of asking the Assembly to increase the duties already voted on raw materials; whence it follows that any modification likely to be proposed in the new Treaty would be in a direction favourable to English views.

There is no reason to question the good faith either of the proposal or of the reasoning on which it is founded. Objectionable as the tax on raw materials is, it would have been very difficult to devise a tax which should be unobjectionable. No one can deny that the financial position of the French Government is one of extraordinary embarrassment, and the worst that can be said of M. THIERS and his advisers is that, with nothing but a choice of fiscal evils before them, they happen to have chosen the one which in our judgment is the worst. When we come to consider, however, what arguments can be alleged in favour of accepting the French proposal, two preliminary objections present themselves—neither perhaps incapable of being surmounted, but neither undeserving of notice. Does the correspondence between the proposed duties on imports and the actual duties on raw materials admit of being defined with sufficient precision, and who is to construct the definition? Supposing that English manufacturers consider that such or such a duty on cotton or woollen goods imported from England would about correspond to the tax on the raw material which has to be paid by the French manufacturer, while the French Government fix the import duty at a higher figure—and still more, supposing that the French Government claim the exclusive right of determining what the true proportion is—it is obvious that the proposed Treaty might be so unpopular as to prevent the English Cabinet from concluding it, or even to threaten its continuance if concluded. It is possible that this difficulty might be got over by leaving the scale of proportion to be arranged by a sort of Joint Commission consisting of experts of both countries; but, unless the French Government is prepared to consent to something of the kind, the prospects of the negotiation in England are extremely doubtful. The second objection refers to the duration of the proposed Treaty. The French Government is understood to hope that England will be pleased by the increased liberty of action afforded to her under the provision for putting an end to the tariff in respect of any single article by simply giving the prescribed notice. But England is not likely to have occasion for the exercise of this liberty. The aspect in which such a reservation is likely to present itself to her is that of a continuous uncertainty as to the fiscal policy of France. Notwithstanding the success of the loan, and other favourable indications of financial elasticity, France will have to encounter many economical difficulties in years to come; and if she is continually modifying her tariff in respect of this or that article, will not the English merchant want the certainty which can alone justify him in entering upon large business transactions? A treaty which is to last for five or ten years gives him something solid to go upon. But a treaty which, as regards his particular interest in it, may at any time come to an end six months hence, may easily seem to him little, if any, better than no treaty at all.

#### THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL ON LAW REFORM.

IN former times a debating society would not have been thought the fittest place for an official announcement of the legal projects of the Government. In fact the ATTORNEY-GENERAL reminded the Social Science Association that, as he was not a member of the Cabinet, he could not positively pledge himself to introduce in the next Session the measures which he is preparing; but it is not probable that either the Prime Minister or the Lord Chancellor who may then be in office would object to well-considered Bills which might probably procure a certain amount of credit to the Government. The first law officer of the Crown is a considerable personage, nor is Sir JOHN COLERIDGE unequal to the duties of his position. His conditional promises accord-

ingly possess a practical importance which seldom attaches to the proceedings which are called Social Science. The paper itself has been inaccurately reported or awkwardly abridged; but it is possible to understand its substance. Sir JOHN COLERIDGE appears to have been at Plymouth unduly sensitive and pugnacious; and probably he would not have taken so unfit an opportunity of propounding his intentions if he had not been annoyed by criticisms on a speech which he lately delivered in the House of Commons. Too much was made of the ATTORNEY-GENERAL's creditable desire to efface the bad impression which had been produced by the language of his colleague. Sir G. JESSEL, with the complacency of a successful practitioner, ridiculed all systematic attempts to improve the law, without understanding the difference between a tolerated delay in improvement, and an absolute rejection of the principle of change. Even if his conclusions had been sound, it would have been imprudent wantonly to disturb the conventional doctrine of the House of Commons and of the laity in general; but when an official person makes a blunder, it is the duty of his colleagues not to expose or aggravate the miscarriage, but, if possible, to cover his retreat. Sir JOHN COLERIDGE consequently intimated as delicately as possible that the SOLICITOR-GENERAL's optimism referred only to Equity, and that a refusal to consider any project of reform was consistent with an enthusiastic desire for organic improvements in the practice and theory of Common Law. Finding that his loyal courtesy had exposed him to misapprehension, Sir JOHN COLERIDGE used the legal section of the Social Science Association as a vehicle for transmitting to the world his definite convictions on some material questions of the controversy.

In the first place, he rightly holds that a Code would be greatly preferable to a Digest; and that it may be constructed whenever the Government of the day thinks fit. The more unambitious task is naturally entrusted to young men in small practice whose names carry no authority. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL would employ in the formation of a Code persons who would otherwise have been eligible for appointment as Judges, and he would provide them with corresponding remuneration and rank. To the general surprise, he even expressed his belief that the present CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER would not grudge the expense of the only means by which the law can be systematically reformed. There can be no doubt that the difficulties of providing an English Code have been greatly over-rated. The French Code, which was commenced by order of the Convention, and named, like all institutions of the time, after NAPOLEON, was substituted for a chaotic mass of local customs which were partially controlled by the rules of the civil law. English law, though its defects have, in accordance with the national tendency to self-depreciation, been often absurdly exaggerated, has to be collected and ascertained by reference to voluminous treatises and to innumerable judicial decisions. The materials for a nearly perfect Code are already provided, and they only require to be arranged in order, and to be elevated to the rank of statute law. It would be the business of the official jurists to decide among conflicting decisions which are limited in number, and which are for the most part well known to lawyers. Few instances could arise in which it would be necessary to provide for contingencies which have not already occurred in practice. The analytic mode of deducing legal principles from particular cases is not less scientific than the methodical anticipation of problems voluntarily selected for solution. In the course of centuries the Judges, many of them possessing extraordinary sagacity, have been compelled to deal with almost every complication which can result from the relations and transactions of society. The rule which binds courts of equal or subordinate jurisdiction to abide by precedents has produced an indispensable uniformity; while the astuteness of able Judges in correcting the errors of their predecessors by subtle distinctions is scarcely liable to the harsh criticism of the ATTORNEY-GENERAL. As political fictions represent the gradual rectification of theory by experience, nice distinctions render the occasional mistakes and oversights of Judges less permanently mischievous. Even after the enactment of the most comprehensive Code, much scope will be unavoidably left for the exercise of judicial discretion. The legislator can only establish principles elaborated into rules of more or less detail; and it is impossible that he should provide for every difficulty which may occur in practice. The later the period at which the business of framing a Code is undertaken, the more adequately will it correspond to the wants of the community. It is only in a simple state of society that MOSES or SOLON can minutely define beforehand the legal conditions of civic life.



It is fortunate that the whole body of law naturally divides itself into heads and chapters which respectively admit of separate treatment. Some of the divisions relate to the subject-matter of legislation, as in the case of commercial or of criminal law, while rules of procedure and the law of evidence apply to large sections, or even to the entire mass, of a system of jurisprudence. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL promises, if he is supported by the Government, to introduce in the next Session an improved law for the regulation of juries, and a complete code of evidence. He is probably well aware that his proposals of legal reform will require the sanction, not only of the Cabinet, but of the able lawyers in the House of Lords, whom, in reference to another point, he mentions with impolitic asperity. It will not be easy to carry measures of law reform against the opposition of Lord CAIRNS and Lord WESTBURY, who are at the same time powerful through their ability and position, and liable to some minor foibles of humanity. Any code of evidence which has a chance of adoption in England must to a large extent be a digest of the existing law. Although some modification of the present rules may probably be desirable, English lawyers will never tolerate the substitution of the laxity which prevails in some foreign countries. Oral testimony of the contents of written documents, and hearsay evidence in general, will long be excluded from English courts of justice. The whole system of affidavits stands urgently in need of additional securities for truth; nor indeed is it possible to avoid dangerous disregard of accuracy when one man swears to a statement which has been drawn up for forensic purposes by another. Nevertheless the ATTORNEY-GENERAL will best promote the larger object of enacting a Code by completing, as a specimen and instalment, one of its important chapters. As he truly says, the labours of Mr. FITZJAMES STEPHEN and of other jurists have provided copious and valuable materials for the undertaking. It may be hoped that his Jury Bill of the last Session will be largely altered before it is reintroduced. The hardships of the existing system, like other actual grievances, are borne more patiently than novel and arbitrary vexations. It is extremely doubtful whether a mixture of classes in the same jury is desirable; and assuredly litigants who have demanded the services of a special jury are not in general disposed to pray a *tales* as long as an intermixture of common jurymen can be avoided.

In common with the great majority of law reformers, Sir JOHN COLERIDGE desires to destroy as far as possible the distinction between Common Law and Equity. He accordingly proposes to confer on all the Superior Courts full equitable and legal jurisdiction, though he seems, not without reason, to suspect that the Judges will be slow to exercise an unfamiliar authority. His researches into the organization of juries and into the law of evidence cannot fail to have suggested to him the existence of one formidable impediment to the fusion of Law and Equity. The stricter rules of evidence, and the whole system of pleading at Common Law, have been rendered necessary by the introduction into judicial practice of the voice of the laity as uttered in the verdicts of juries. It would be absurd to propose to a jury the determination of the questions which are raised by the detailed narrative contained in a Bill and Answer in Chancery. It is necessary, *per cause del ignorance des lay gents*, to eliminate one or more definite issues to be submitted to the jury, and to exclude from their cognisance all evidence except that of the purest quality. It is also impossible that juries should award specific performance of a contract, or any other kind of relief which cannot be reduced to a few simple words and figures. It is to distinctions of this kind that the ATTORNEY-GENERAL appears to refer when he says that cases necessarily distribute themselves under different heads; and it can only be known by experience whether it is better that certain kinds of questions should be referred to the same or to separate Courts. Nothing would be gained by sending a certain number of *Nisi Prius* trials to the Master of the Rolls, while a corresponding share of Chancery litigation was allotted to the Judges of the Queen's Bench or Common Pleas. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL declines for the present to commit himself to the wide changes which were proposed by Lord CAIRNS's Commission. It is not easy to understand what benefit would be secured by substituting for the historical titles of the English Courts newfangled names such as the First or Second Chamber. It seems, at least in the first instance, more expedient to try the experiment of enlarging the powers of the Courts of Law and Equity; and all the world is agreed on the propriety of reconstituting the Court of Appeal. Of Sir JOHN COLERIDGE's proposal it may be said that it is apparently simple; and it at least contrasts favour-

ably with the whimsical project of the Select Committee of the House of Lords; yet a prudent adviser would have recommended the ATTORNEY-GENERAL to suppress his eloquent sarcasms on the Law Lords who have the power to approve or to reject his future measures.

#### VOTE BY BALLOT AT PRESTON.

THE Mayor of Preston, in making arrangements for the election of last week, had the advantage of the experience derived from the election at Pontefract. Everything seems to have been done to give the Ballot a fair trial. There were polling-places in abundance, and care was taken that the officials at each station should not be overwhelmed by an undue influx of voters. The reception of from two to three hundred votes is not a very severe day's work, and this limitation allows a safe margin for delays, unless indeed there should happen to be a rush of illiterates towards the close of the poll. The voting-places were fitted up so that electors could easily pass in at one door, record their votes in snug seclusion, and pass out at the other end of the building. There were placards on every side indicating to voters the way they should go, and the officials appear to have been painstaking, not to say profuse, in their explanations to bewildered citizens. It is calculated that intelligent electors of clear mind and resolute character gave their votes and left the room, on an average, in less than a minute, while the illiterates occupied three minutes each. In the comparative agility of the illiterates of Preston we may perhaps trace the stimulating influence of machinery; those at Pontefract, being less in contact with steam power, were extremely slow in their passage through the booths. The case of wilfully obstructive voters is possibly reserved for the future experience of returning officers. The time is not prescribed during which a conscientious but doubting voter is entitled to remain in his secret compartment, exercising his memory in an attempt to recollect the name of the candidate for whom he has promised to vote, or mentally reviewing the various arguments in favour of the rival candidates. The Conservative agents appear to have spared no pains to educate their party for the new method of election. It is stated that illiterates were invited to preliminary meetings at which ballot-boxes and other refreshments were provided, and the process of voting was carefully rehearsed. On both sides the agents seem to have resolved to do what they could to get rid of secrecy of election—as far, at least, as the progress of the polling was concerned. Information which it is illegal to solicit inside a polling-place may be legally obtained outside, and accordingly the Liberal managers distributed cards among their followers, begging them to deliver these cards as soon as they had voted at the nearest Committee-room. The Conservatives also sent out cards, but, with a more profound knowledge of human nature and its weaknesses, posted men at every polling-place to collect the tickets, thus sparing the voters the trouble of seeking out and going to a Committee-room. The ticket-collectors kept a record, not only of the tickets they received, but of the whole number of voters who passed through the polling-places, and they were thus enabled to estimate the numbers on each side. A voter who had no card or who gave an unfavourable answer was of course put down to the Liberal candidate. In this way the Conservatives contrived to publish returns of the progress of the voting, which, to the amazement of the Liberals, who had denounced the whole thing as a foolish hoax, were found at the close of the day to be tolerably exact. The Conservatives claimed a majority of 709 for their candidate, and when the poll was officially declared he had a majority of 718. The plan of the Liberals for ascertaining the course of the voting proved to be an utter failure. It was not expected that the counting of the votes would be completed on Friday night, but the Mayor, by employing a large staff of assistants, managed to get through the task in about three hours. At Preston, as at Pontefract, there was a conspicuous falling off in the number of voters who went to the poll as compared with those at the previous election. A fifth of the electors did not vote. It has been argued that it is only the novelty of the new system which keeps electors away, and that this will soon wear off. On the other hand, curiosity is a feeling of considerable influence, and it can hardly be doubted that it induced some voters to visit the polling-place for the sake of seeing what an election by ballot was like. It is stated that seventy or eighty blank voting-papers were found in the boxes. Nothing could be quieter than the nomination, but towards evening on the day of the polling there were some mild symptoms of political efferves-

ence. The circumstances of the election were hardly such as to produce much enthusiasm or excitement on either side, and there is no reason to suppose that, even if the Ballot Act had not been in operation, there would have been any disturbances.

It would obviously be unwise to draw wide and confident conclusions from the limited experience of isolated elections such as those which have taken place since the new system of voting came into force. All that has as yet been proved in favour of that system is that the abolition of public nominations is conducive to public order and decorum, and that in a constituency of moderate size, and in the absence of violent political feeling, there is no insuperable mechanical difficulty in taking votes by ballot. There is no connexion, however, between private nominations and the Ballot, and it remains to be seen whether a highly artificial and complicated system of recording votes will work altogether smoothly in a large constituency at a time of excitement. The sudden irruption towards the close of the poll of a tumultuous throng of angry voters, irritated at being kept waiting, and afraid lest they should lose their votes, would be apt to disturb official arrangements of the most perfect kind; and it is easy to conceive that a delay in announcing the result of an election, or a serious difference between the figures of the returning officer and the confident expectations of the mob, might also be productive of unpleasant consequences. Even as it is, it is not satisfactory to observe that the introduction of the Ballot has been followed by a growing disinclination to go to the poll on the part of a considerable section of the electors. Taking the Ballot at its best, it can hardly be said to be so simple and expeditious a mode of voting as the open system. It is admitted that it is attended with much trouble, inconvenience, and some rather formidable dangers, of which we may have experience hereafter, in the way of relaxing the securities for honest returns; and when we ask what are to be the compensating advantages, we find that practical experience is somewhat at variance with the promises and predictions of the advocates of secret voting. It was asserted that there was a large body of electors who were only waiting for the Ballot in order to escape from the cruel and humiliating despotism of landlords and employers. The results of the elections at Pontefract and Preston would seem to show either that intimidation has not been practised to the extent assumed by the supporters of the Ballot, which we should be quite ready to believe, or that the Ballot affords extremely inadequate protection to voters who are oppressed in this manner. After the experience of Preston it is clear that secrecy of voting is altogether at the option of electors. It is obviously impossible by the most ingenious or elaborate legislation to prevent tests being applied to electors to ascertain how they are going to vote, or how they have voted; and the Ballot is a protection only to the man who is willing to pretend that he is on one side when he is really on the other. It appears that at Preston the Conservative electors voted pretty closely according to the colour of the cards which they afterwards gave up; and the Liberals, who assert that this was the result of intimidation, are simply exposing the futility of their favourite measure. Either the electors voted according to their own opinions, in which case there was no intimidation to be put down, or they sacrificed their opinions because they scrupled to tell a lie; and in that case the Ballot was clearly no security against intimidation. The only justification for the Ballot was the plea that it would prevent intimidation, and if that is given up, there is nothing to be said for it. The *Manchester Examiner*, the chief organ of the Radicals in Lancashire, has just discovered that "the secrecy of the Ballot merely enables the voter in the last resort to vote as he pleases; but it does not afford him protection against moral coercion. He can still be compelled by an unscrupulous employer to promise his vote, in which case he will either have to keep his promise at the cost of his convictions, or to break it with the intention of professing that he had kept it." Our contemporary fears that "it is also possible to attempt bribery under the Ballot by the use of ingenious contrivances to which electioneering agents are quite equal"; and "the Preston election is not quite free from suspicion on both scores." These accusations may perhaps be traced to the exasperation of defeat; but it is significant that the sort of people who have for years been clamouring for the Ballot as the great pill that was to cure all political disorders should at the very second dose be making wry faces over it, and denouncing it as a quack medicine. The result would seem to be that we have revolutionized our system of voting, and sacrificed our best securities for honest voting and honest returns, in an attempt to cure an evil which was acknowledged to be gradually

dying out from natural causes, and that the fanatics who forced the nostrum upon us are the first to proclaim its worthlessness.

It would appear that the Radicals of Lancashire, though disheartened by the result of the Preston election, are by no means desponding. The Ballot, it is true, has not answered their expectations. It served their purpose better as a cry than as a law, but the only thing now is to look out for something else. An enterprising young politician of this party, in a speech at Manchester some months ago, insisted upon the necessity of getting up a roaring fire under the Liberal boilers, and it would seem that fuel is now being sought in all quarters for this purpose. At the Preston election in 1868 the Liberals started a Roman Catholic and a violent member of the Liberation Society, but the result was not very satisfactory. This time they thought they would try a moderate man, but since Friday week they have come to the conclusion that moderate men are a mistake, and there is a reaction in favour of extremes. "Compromises," it is said, "do no good, and future contests may as well be fought out on the broadest issues." It is true that Major GERMAN is not exactly what can be called a full-bodied politician, but it may be doubted whether it was his moderation which brought about his defeat. He was certainly not so successful as Mr. HOLKER in keeping out of the way of objectionable agitators. It is natural perhaps for a major of Militia to think that too much ought not to be made of the regulars, but Major GERMAN lost his balance when he denounced standing armies in order to please the economists and the peace-at-any-price party. Again, we find some of the Liberals complaining bitterly of the harm he did their cause by coquetting with the United Kingdom Alliance. This of course set the publicans against him, and not only the publicans, but all reasonable persons who distrust fanaticism and violence. Then he rather hedged with the Contagious Diseases people, and Mr. ODGER's visit left a bad whiff in the air. On the whole we should say that the Major was rather weak than moderate; he was willing to go "to a certain extent" in several objectionable directions, and had not the strength of mind and moral courage to keep clear of damaging connexions. Mr. HOLKER was more resolute in his negative policy, and it was to this probably that he owed most of his success. It is natural perhaps that the Liberals, disappointed in their hopes of the Ballot as a help to them at the elections, should cast about for another cry; but it may be questioned whether, in the present temper of the country, they will do themselves much good by listening to the advice of impulsive young Radicals who want to shine in the light of a big fire.

#### RELIGIOUS REACTION IN FRANCE.

IT is never wise to believe in the absolute overthrow of political forces, provided that they are purely political. Where an army has been defeated a large proportion of the combatants has usually been rendered incapable of further service. But a defeat in the Legislature or at the polls carries no such consequence with it. It does but register the relative strength of the opposing parties at a given moment. The men who have fought remain, and when the first sense of discouragement has passed away, they naturally begin to consider how they may renew the conflict with better chances. It almost always happens that fortune shows them some favour in this respect. The results of a victory are sure to be distasteful to some of those who have helped to win it, and the strategy of the conquered force has rarely been so good as not to admit of being improved by a careful review of the causes which led to their failure. The history of reactions is the same all the world over, and one of the most curious elements of this identity is that every party in succession seems to believe that it will be exempt from the universal law. In no instance has this faith been more profound than in that of the Continental Liberals in their triumph over the Roman Catholic Church. The march of mind, the progress of free thought, the decay of old superstitions—whatever has been the phrase most in favour for the moment as a description of the fact that the Liberals have beaten the Clericals—is always assumed to be ceaseless and irresistible. To-morrow is to be as to-day and much more enlightened. This cheerful state of mind naturally leads the victors to despise their adversaries, and the form which this contempt for the most part takes is a refusal to make any compromise with them. Instead of allying themselves with moderate men on the defeated side to devise some means by which the two parties may live together in peace, they do their best to make it impossible for moderate men on the defeated side to have any dealings with the conquerors. They



act as though their chief desire were to give their enemies the advantage of being united among themselves.

There is every reason to fear that the remarkable religious reaction now going on in France will be another example of this constantly recurring process. As to the fact of the reaction, no doubt can be entertained. The holy places which abound in many parts of the country have been visited throughout the summer by an extraordinary number of pilgrims. Between the 1st of May and the 31st of August 117 special trains brought, at the lowest estimate, 95,000 persons to Lourdes, the chief of these shrines. This does not include devotees of the better class who travel by the ordinary trains. During the present month the tide of pilgrims will continue to flow, and on the 6th of October it will reach high-water mark. A "national pilgrimage" has long been in preparation for that day, and great efforts are being made to invest it with theological and political importance. The Roman Catholic Church in France seems to share to the utmost that wonderful vitality which has characterized the nation since the war. The French ecclesiastic is as elastic as the French politician; he recovers as rapidly after defeat, he forgets the lessons of adversity as easily, or rather perhaps he as persistently and ingeniously misreads them. Two causes have combined to favour this reaction. In the first place, it represents the religious side of that moral antipathy to Paris which has of late years been growing up throughout provincial France. When the clergy ceased to trust the ecclesiastical policy of NAPOLEON III., they had no longer any motive for throwing a veil over his failings, and they have probably taken every occasion to draw comparisons between the frugal and homely virtue approved by the Church, and the vicious and costly luxury which found favour at the Imperial Court. The sober citizen or the well-to-do peasant who has listened to them has not himself been moved to go on pilgrimage, unless indeed he has seen his way to combining the expedition with some object of business or pleasure. But he has probably made no objection to his wife or an enthusiastic young son, of whom he intends to make a priest, discharging the duty for him. He has come to see that, whether Catholicism be true or false, it affords a certain security against the sins which run away with money, and lead the sons to squander in Paris the property which the fathers have painfully got together in the country. His love for the priest is probably no greater than before, but he has a keener sense that he cannot afford to quarrel with him. In the second place, the Church has gained by being an object of hatred to the Commune. In a country like France no greater mistake can be committed than to give your adversary a martyr. Yet this was what the Commune did by murdering the Archbishop of PARIS. The Conservatism of France was at once enlisted on the side of the Church. The irreligion of the extreme Republicans would not necessarily have startled men who at the bottom of their hearts believe little more than the Republicans do. But the murder of the ARCHBISHOP threw a new light upon this irreligion. It showed it to be destructive of order as well as of Theism, to be dangerous to human life as well as to divine faith. You cannot have everything in this world. Freedom of thought will occasionally lead to a freedom of action which is productive of the most inconvenient consequences. After all, the rule of the Church is better than the rule of the Commune, and though a tranquil and civilized scepticism would make a better master than either, the populace must have something that appeals to their feelings as well as to their reason, and nothing will so well ensure that they shall not be revolutionists as encouraging them to become good Catholics. These two causes have availed probably to neutralize much of the opposition which the religious reaction might otherwise have encountered. The motives which have created the reaction are not so obvious. Religious movements rarely conform to any known laws. But it is easy to understand that, if the seeds of such a reaction existed, the period of suffering and serious excitement through which the nation has lately passed was exactly calculated to nurture them into vigorous life. The sudden overthrow of all that Frenchmen had been accustomed to trust in left such a void as has often paved the way for religious revivals. Besides this, local Catholic minorities became known to each other. The Ultramontane of the South fought side by side with the Ultramontane of Brittany, and each gained by companionship a new sense of political and social strength.

If this religious reaction were itself under wise guidance, or if the wisdom of those opposed to it could be at all relied on, it might be productive of lasting good to France. Neither the pure Voltairianism of the great towns, nor the single-

hearted devotion to money-getting which characterizes the peasantry, are elements out of which national greatness is likely to be built up. But unfortunately it is almost certain that the religious reaction will not be under wise guidance. This is not said merely because of the miraculous character which it appears to claim for itself. Supposing the faith in the alleged cures and apparitions to be genuine, the moral result might not be affected by the improbabilities which attach to them in the eyes of Protestants, or of Catholics accustomed to sift evidence strictly. It is the use that will be made of the moral result that constitutes the danger. While Pius IX. lives there seems to be no power in the Roman Catholic Episcopate to dissociate the temporal interests of the Papal sovereignty from the spiritual interests of the Church. All that the French bishops may regain by the religious reaction will be wasted in the effort to rebuild his fallen throne. The French Government for the time being will be judged solely by its Italian policy, and an influence which in other hands might be most useful in consolidating and strengthening the Conservative tendencies of the French people will be at the call of any pretender who cares to make capital out of amissguided religious sentiment. So long as M. THIERS is at the head of affairs the other danger is by comparison trifling. He has shown the utmost respect for the Roman Catholic Church, and at Lyons in two conspicuous instances he has taken its side against the civil authorities. Such of the primary schools as were under the management of ecclesiastics before the war have been restored to them against the strong opposition of the municipality, and the civil and military functionaries have been allowed to take part in a solemn procession organized by the ARCHBISHOP on the 8th of this month. M. THIERS is far too wise a man to suppose that religious equality can ever in practice be pushed to the extreme of denying to the religion professed by the majority of the nation the enjoyment of such formal privileges as can be conceded without inflicting any real hardship on those who are shut out from sharing in them. But there are many members of the Republican party in whose eyes the recognition of this obvious fact is a heresy of the worst kind. If the clergy push their advantage too far, they may so alienate this section from the Government as to lead to the forfeiture of that claim to general acquiescence which is at present possessed by the Republic, and to land France once more in anarchy.

#### CREDULITY.

A case has been recently reported in the newspapers to which, as it has not yet arrived at a conclusion, we shall not refer in any detail. It is enough to say that it appears to present an almost pathetic instance of human credulity. A man of apparent respectability—that is to say, dressed in decent clothes and capable of talking legal jargon with sufficient fluency to convince ignorant people of his professional knowledge—goes to various persons who have a claim to certain property. He assures them that the Queen takes an interest in their case, and that he has been despatched by the Lord Chancellor to investigate the matter. On the strength of these assertions he induces them to advance various sums of money—a single person, it is stated, having advanced as much as 1,000*l*. We are afterwards told, as might have been anticipated, that the volunteer defender of the oppressed had as much connexion with the Lord Chancellor as he has with the Tycoon of Japan; and, in short, he is accused of perpetrating a gigantic swindle. We need not inquire how far these allegations will eventually be supported by evidence. Whatever may be the result of further inquiry, the simplicity of the ingenious people who have confided sums of so much importance to them to a person of whom they know absolutely nothing is equally remarkable. If they have not been swindled, it is plain that any designing person might have swindled them; and their easy trustfulness suggests some obvious reflections upon the facility with which people may obtain credence in a world which we are accustomed to revile for the general lack of confidence between man and man.

In the first place, it is rather difficult to say whether this revelation is on the whole gratifying or the reverse. Undoubtedly it is in one sense lamentable to find that there are so many fools in the world. But that is after all no new fact. The amount of sheer unadulterated stupidity in existence is plainly something appalling. If we were in any way capable of giving an arithmetical expression of its prevalence, we should have to deal in numbers as stupendous as those with which astronomers are in the habit of stunning our imaginations. This, however, is too notorious a fact to deserve much remark. It is more gratifying, if we choose to look upon the reverse side of the question, to observe what a marvellous store of mutual confidence must be in existence. The simple truth is, that such confidence is every day more necessary as knowledge increases; it is more and more necessary for every man to take ninety-nine-hundredths of all his knowledge upon trust. If

anybody were resolved to investigate personally every statement before he received it, his mind would be in as hopeless a condition as would be his body if he insisted upon feeding and clothing himself without assistance from his neighbours. The division of labour implies that we are to be in every way more and more dependent upon other people, both for our knowledge and for the supply of our material wants. And therefore the first necessity for everybody in these times is to understand what are the conditions which renders testimony credible. As we cannot investigate each case, we must go by some general rule, and be content if on the whole we obtain only a few grains of falsehood to a bushel of fact. It appears that the most general principle upon which the mass of mankind have hitherto been able to agree is that every statement made by a man in a black coat is to be regarded as true. There are knaves in black coats, but their number is so small that it may be practically neglected. It is easy and interesting to try the experiment. Many people, for example, must have found themselves at a loss for money on a Continental trip. If they are novices in the art of travel, they have been very uncomfortable in consequence, and have perhaps placed themselves in pawn, like Mr. Titmarsh in the town of Lille, until they could receive remittances from home. But a little experience will teach them a simpler plan. Go to any innkeeper on the Continent, and ask him in bad French to lend you fifty pounds. He will produce the money with as much willingness as if he knew on unimpeachable evidence that you had all the resources of the Bank of England at your disposal. The more you ask, and the more coolly you make your request, the more certain it is to be granted. It may be that loss is occasionally incurred by this trusting disposition, but on the whole it is plain that so much confidence must have been justified by the result. We must confess that when we have seen instances of this admirable provision of nature, we have sometimes been assailed by a dark temptation. What is the use of a good character if one is never to turn it into cash? Observe the extraordinary ease with which any scamp succeeds in obtaining credit on the mere strength of a fair imitation of external decency; how frequently he deludes not merely ignorant tradesmen in a country town, but even shrewd men of the world who pique themselves on their sagacity. Then calculate how much more a man could obtain who had not merely the appearance, but the reality, who had been sincerely honest, paid all his bills up to a respectable period of life, and acquired a good character by genuine work. If he resolved to exchange honesty for profit, what limits could be fairly set to his chances of success? Might he not go into his friends' houses and possess himself of any articles which struck his fancy? Might he not, if so disposed, murder half-a-dozen people to whom he might have taken a dislike? Might he not finally raise, say, ten times the amount of his capital, and retire to some distant country where no Extradition Treaty is in force, and enjoy his gains, as much as his conscience—an article, however, with which we presume him to have parted—would admit? We must beg it to be distinctly understood that we do not recommend any such course of conduct. We should consider it to be distinctly wrong, and should be glad if by any accident, however improbable, the scheme should break down and the performer become an inmate of a penal settlement. We merely remark on the ease with which the plan could be carried out as a proof of the engaging confidence of mankind; and it is gratifying to believe that it is a rare occurrence for such plans to be put in execution. When we indulge in such reflections we can hardly blame the credulous persons at Wolverhampton. Every day of our lives almost we are implicitly trusting to the honour of some banker or attorney of whom, if we were cross-examined, we could say very little more than that he lives in a respectable house and wears decent garments. Now and then some smash occurs which proves that our confidence has been misplaced; but in the long run we find it pays better to trust than to mistrust everybody; and we should find it rather hard to say in what respect the persons who are now said to have been defrauded have shown less caution than their superiors.

When we come to apply these principles to matters of speculative opinion, we see how needless is the astonishment sometimes expressed at the credulity of human beings. A maidservant believes in the silly prophecies of a gipsy; a labourer is converted by the assurances of a Mormon missionary; an educated man is persuaded by the assurances of a medium that Bacon or Franklin is talking to him in a mahogany table. We call them credulous, and rightly enough; but our wonder is surely unnecessary. They are merely doing what the best philosophers amongst us are doing every day. They are taking on trust statements of fact about matters which they cannot personally investigate from persons of whose credentials they are insufficient judges. The maidservant has no means of knowing why science should not foretell her future marriage as easily as it foretells an eclipse; the labourer cannot distinguish between the claims to respect of the unctuous Mormon and the Archbishop of Canterbury; and the Spiritualist fancies that a medium gives him as tangible proofs of authority as the Pope. The difference between such victims of credulity and many persons of far better education is not that their reasoning faculties are less, but simply that they have less knowledge of mankind. They consider the black-coat test to be sufficient, and have not yet become aware that there are black coats and black coats, and that there is a vast difference between the respect due to a village conjuror and to the Astronomer Royal, both of whom are persons who reveal

a knowledge of the future by means entirely unintelligible to them. A little more experience would of course reveal the fact that the information received from one authority is more trustworthy than that received from another, but it is only a very small minority which is able to test the value of the information by following out the processes as well as by judging of the results. The difference between the credulity existing in high and in low stations is not so much a difference in logical training as in the degree of knowledge of the ways of the world. The educated man may know as little of the laws as his poorer neighbour, but he has a clearer impression as to the mode in which the Queen and the Lord Chancellor bestir themselves in legal matters; and, in the same way, he is not a better judge, it may be, of scientific methods, but he knows who are the people best qualified to form a judgment, and what is their opinion as to the relative skill of conjurors and astronomers.

When we remember how overwhelming a proportion of the knowledge of all but a few of us is taken upon authority, we may be disposed to smile at the astonishment expressed by some philosophers at certain phenomena of belief. They wonder, for example, at the persistence of the superstition about witchcraft. But their wonder might cease if they would reflect how infinitesimal a minority of mankind are competent judges of the evidence in such matters, and how little ignorant labourers can estimate the weight of opinion against their superstitions. The bulk of the world is no cleverer than of old, and has but little more information. Why should it not be as foolish as ever? The opposite cause for wonder has been noticed by Mr. Lecky. He thinks it strange that the witchcraft superstition should have vanished so rapidly as it has done without the help of any new and conclusive arguments. The reason is surely obvious, and depends on the same principle. The bulk of mankind does, and always must, take its opinions on trust. When a few philosophers were convinced that the belief was groundless, it was killed at the root. It died out rapidly, because the men whose opinion had most weight had been gradually convinced by sufficient arguments. It was deprived of the sanction that gave it strength and vitality. But though that particular crop of foolish beliefs was blighted, the soil remained pretty much as it was before. And therefore we see new beliefs of equal absurdity springing up with amazing rapidity whenever they receive the shadow of an authority—that is, whenever a man in a black coat asserts positively that they are true. Great is the power of dress, and there are few experiments in credulity which may not be safely tried by the help of the black coat.

#### THE GEOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY AND LIEUTENANT DAWSON.

THE second Report of the Livingstone Search Committee of the Royal Geographical Society puts the public in possession of all the materials which need be desired for forming a definite opinion upon the issues raised by the abandonment of the expedition. Until the arrival in this country of Lieutenant Dawson, when opportunity could be afforded to him of explaining or vindicating his conduct, there would have been an obvious unfairness on the part either of the Committee or the public at large in passing judgment upon the course he had chosen to pursue. Until he touched on his way home at Madeira and saw some English newspapers, Lieutenant Dawson had not the faintest notion of his course having met with anything but approval at the hands of all concerned. It was under this impression that he had written his first despatch from Zanzibar on the 19th of May, announcing his intended return; and it was thought likely that, on being made aware of the criticisms which had been passed upon his conduct, and upon the terms in which he had couched his apology, he would have been prepared with pleas of an additional or a more forcible kind by way of extenuation. At the first meeting, in reply to the question of the Committee whether he had any statement to make in addition to his Report, he replied that he had not, but that he should be prepared with answers to any questions that might be put to him in writing. Upon the style of his replies to the five questions of the Committee, any more than upon the tone of his later comments in the newspapers, it is not within our present scope to speak. The deplorable lack of judgment betrayed in his abrupt abandonment of the important trust committed to him seems to us only too conspicuously manifested in what he is pleased to consider the logical explanation of his motives. He is not for resting his case simply upon the fact of Livingstone's discovery and relief, or even upon the traveller's message deprecating further visitation or aid. What he mainly relies upon is the assumption of a state of mind on Livingstone's part antipathetic to any participation in or knowledge of his work, especially pointed against the Geographical Society and all concerned in it. It was not the "forestalment of the main objects of the expedition," he pleads, in answer to the first question of the Committee, that led to his breaking it up, but the thought that "further procedure to map the country, and endeavour to procure copies of Dr. Livingstone's geographical information, would prove injurious to him," for reasons to be farther developed in his fifth answer; and he goes on to urge in Answer 2 that his "presence as a surveyor would prove annoying and detrimental to Dr. Livingstone, while as escort only superfluous and expensive." For the existence in Livingstone's mind of this prepossession he finds ground in certain passages in a Blue-book shown him at Zanzibar, and omitted, he believes, in bad faith by



the Geographical Society at home in their published proceedings; in which passages the traveller complains of his maps and despatches having been tampered with, and declares he will remit no more of his notes through the channel of the Society. To this is added what he terms "Dr. Livingstone's *ipse dixit* to the same effect before last entering the country," together with "Dr. Kirk's thorough knowledge of Dr. Livingstone's character and frame of mind."

To the former of these pleas the Committee rejoin with force that they come too late. Lieutenant Dawson should have foreseen and calculated his relations to Livingstone as a surveyor or hydrographer before signing the instructions in which his duties as regarded geography were laid down. There was nothing in those instructions to suggest the idea of his acting in the slightest degree in antagonism or rivalry to Livingstone, or in any other way than in entire subordination to his wishes. There was no authority conveyed in them to him to pump the great traveller, or to forestall him in the publication of what he had achieved. Nothing need be solicited from him beyond what he had heretofore freely supplied. Besides, it must be borne in mind that this portion of Mr. Dawson's instructions is comprised in the paragraph which begins with the hypothesis of the rumour of Livingstone's death being unhappily verified. In that case there would not only be perfect freedom, but obvious urgency, even in the interest and for the furtherance of Livingstone's designs, for taking up and eking out the geographical facts he had discovered. If otherwise, what difficulty need there have been on the part of a skilled officer of tact and sense of duty in subordinating himself in all such matters to the will and disposition of his chief, both receiving and giving information? Nay, of what invaluable service might not a skilled hydrographer and observer have been, if only in tendering the means of testing and verifying Livingstone's observations, and correcting and repairing his worn-out or battered instruments, or setting him up with the new and first-rate set specially put under his charge from Kew? Is it to be conceived that the love of accuracy and truth has yielded in Livingstone's mind to an egotistic desire to monopolize the facts of nature? Or, are we to go further, and, with certain newspaper correspondents who put themselves forward as advocates jointly of the traveller and of Lieutenant Dawson, suggest something so utterly mean and petty as the injury to the prospects of Livingstone's forthcoming book which might ensue from his notes getting abroad, or from an assistant entering into his labours? Such, at least, was not the nature of the Livingstone whom we have been wont to venerate as the heroic self-abjuring seeker after truth for its own sake. Doggedly as he may hold to the idea of his having hit the Nile in the series of lake rivers which he has traced in his latest explorations, are we to conceive him hardening his mind against the fact, which might have been urged upon him by independent reasoning and superior instrumental proof, that this river of his in lat. 12° S. had no higher elevation than that of the Nile 17° further to the North? Was he ever known as the man to steel himself against the discoveries of others, or to prefer isolation from sympathy and help to the sharing with the world such gains to knowledge as had fallen to him? Least of all would he be likely to withhold from one of his own countrymen, officially accredited, the confidence and the outburst of triumph and hope which he could pour forth even to garrulity upon the Correspondent of an American newspaper. Was there anyhow no hope for the reinstatement in Livingstone's mind of his countrymen, his friend Dr. Kirk, and the Society which had done its best for his relief, in that position of favour and generous remembrance in which they had for an instant been supplanted by a stranger?

Being asked whether he took pains to write to Livingstone to assure him of the interest which was felt for his welfare by the Geographical Society and by the British public at large, as testified by the expedition under his charge, Lieutenant Dawson replies with a precision worthy of *nisi prius*, that no one to his knowledge wrote to Dr. Livingstone of the interest in his welfare felt by the Society, but that he "believes both Dr. Kirk and Mr. Oswald Livingstone wrote to inform him of the interest felt for him by the British public." Might not a word in season, accompanying the letters of those gentlemen in which the arrival of the expedition at Zanzibar was reported, have paved the way for a complete understanding between the great traveller and the bearer of the Society's wishes and succours? Were all these inducements to give way to the ambiguous phrases of a hastily written despatch or the tittle-tattle of Zanzibar?

On breaking up the expedition permission was given by Lieutenant Dawson to Lieutenant Henn and Mr. Oswald Livingstone to convey a supply of stores to Dr. Livingstone at Unyamwebe, such stores being, he considered, the Doctor's property, and the great expense of the expedition having been already incurred. Being asked why, then, did he not go himself, Mr. Dawson is not content to plead the terms of his Admiralty leave, but, urges that Lieutenant Henn, "not being a surveyor, or provided with private instructions for mapping the country," would not in the same way appear to prejudice Livingstone's work. Seeing, however, that the way having been already pioneered by Mr. Stanley, there would have been little difficulty in getting back within the term of eighteen months allowed him by the Admiralty, was it right in the leader of an expedition like this to turn back from conveying to the long-lost traveller the supplies, medicines, and instruments destined for him, besides the personal assurance of the interest and sympathy universally felt for him at

home? Lieutenant Dawson, it appears, did not even write to Livingstone. Not a line from him announced either the mission itself or its abandonment. He was satisfied with the message brought down by Mr. Stanley, that the great explorer wished every expedition for his relief or aid to be sent back, and that he was in want of nothing, save 10*l.* worth of drugs. And hereupon he threw up the command, with the singular proviso that Lieutenant Henn might, if he liked, go forward with Livingstone's son, not, forsooth, being a surveyor, and consequently not being likely to move the discoverer's pique or to prejudice his work. The result is that all the stores and instruments, Livingstone's property, as we are told they were, are sold off at a loss of thirty per cent. The Committee rightly decline to cast blame upon the subordinate members of the expedition, thrown over as they were by their leader. But they could not avoid expressing their deep regret at the collapse of the undertaking, and their strong censure of the conduct of Lieutenant Dawson in so abruptly turning his back upon it. The utmost that might have been urged on his behalf is Livingstone's brusque and possibly biased declaration that he wished to see nobody, and wanted nothing. But is it meet on all occasions to construe offhand words of refusal to the letter? We have known a great hero give out that all he wanted for a campaign was a towel and a piece of soap. But we never understood that it was thought at the Horse Guards the right thing to start him thus slenderly equipped. When another hero tells us that all he needs for battling two years or so with unknown foes in nature, in disease, and in savage neighbours is ten pounds' worth of drugs, we would rather not be the man to take him at his word. If the great African traveller comes once more to want, if his geographical work is spoilt or thrown away for lack of adequate or trustworthy instruments, if his heart is broken by finding that he has all along been pursuing a geographical phantom, or if he carries with him through his task a soreness and a sense of injury or neglect against his faithful friend Dr. Kirk, and the whole body of scientific geographers at home, much of the blame will undoubtedly be due to the failure of that trust which the Royal Geographical Society reposed in Lieutenant Dawson.

#### GENTLEMEN FARMERS.

ALTHOUGH agriculture is the most ancient and honourable of callings, it is only of late years that people in England have come to consider it "a profession for a gentleman." This is the more strange since from time immemorial there has been hardly an affluent member of the English aristocracy who has not farmed on his own account. From the Palace to the modest Hall or House, the home farm has been almost as necessary an appendage to the country gentleman's place as the kitchen-garden. Its owner bought and sold too, and probably higgled over odd sovereigns in person or vicariously like any one of his tenants, although to be sure, in nineteen cases out of twenty, there was one saving clause in his manner of farming. It did not pay except in the way of amusement. Nor do we deny that there have always been gentlemen farmers as well as gentlemen who farmed. But these were either fortunate exceptions—men with an irrepressible bent in that direction, who took to crops and cattle as other born geniuses turn to steam-engines or machinery—or else they were settled on their own land, as their fathers for the most part had been before them. They were bred and born to the business, and their easy income left them ample margin to live as gentlemen in the country like to live. Habit had made their glance of inspection almost infallible, and their people knew that it was idle to take liberties even if the master's eye were removed for a day. They could afford to pay competent and trustworthy subordinates, and indeed, owing to the extent of their holdings, were almost obliged to do much of their work by deputy. Above all, on the strength of their means they could take good years with bad, and trust placidly to time establishing a satisfactory average. Their mode of living was unpretentious: they stood little upon position, and it was scarcely conceivable that any combination of calamities should crush them, although they might very possibly be pinched. Their lot in life was perhaps about the most enviable the world could give, but then to all intents and purposes they were country gentlemen and not farming adventurers.

We use the word adventurer in no invidious sense. Every man is an adventurer who makes his start in life from small beginnings, determined to better himself before he dies. It is adventure which has made England what it is, and it is in the spirit of enterprise that we put our trust when our spirits are overmuch depressed by the croakings of prophets of ill omen, and professional critics of our institutions. But, in the sense of having to face risks and vicissitudes, of having to learn to bear up against incessant and wearing anxiety, no man is more of an adventurer than the small farmer. The game may not seem so desperate as that of the miner who stakes his all on the chance of a vein or a nugget, or of the unfriended barrister who sits expectant in his chambers until his talents shall be recognized, or he shall marry a solicitor's daughter. Nor would it need to be, for the farmer must reckon upon playing it for the better part of his life, and if the chances vary less, and if skill goes for much in it, still the gains at best are small, and great prizes are unknown. We have no wish to paint altogether *en noir*, and we own at once that there is much to recommend farming to a vigorous man of placid, contented mind, who delights in the country and detests

cities. Had Fortune been as kind to him as she might have been, she would have made him a well-acred squire, with beeves and sheep in his home pastures, and game in his covers. As it is, he is bound to confess that he has no great cause to grumble. She has given him an admirable constitution, an excellent appetite, a keen capacity for enjoying country life, and a disinterested appreciation of rural charms, even when they are the property of others. And he is not going, merely because she has withheld something, to fly ungratefully in her face by condemning himself to a life of wretchedness amid bricks and mortar, by toiling for dyspepsia and liver complaint in the close confinement of a counting-house. Luckily he is not an absolute pauper; among her other gifts, Fortune did not forget to bestow upon him a younger son's portion of some 2,000*l.* or 3,000*l.*, and with his simple rural tastes and a sum like that he may surely apply himself to the life he loves best. So he resolves to do things methodically, and educate himself for the career he has decided on. He goes to school with some agriculturist of repute who is exceedingly cunning in chemical composts, very deep in the system of subsoil drainage, and a medallist renowned at Islington and elsewhere. There he farms a little and shoots a good deal. He learns to drench a cow and cut dockens over with a spud. Or possibly his natural genius develops itself, and turns him out an accomplished farmer for his years.

The next thing is to find a field where he may turn his acquirements to profitable account. There is necessarily a good deal to be considered, and some of the considerations are extraneous, if not antagonistic, to the practical matter of profit and loss. He is a gentleman, and naturally cannot consent to isolate himself for life from men of his class. He is a man of education, and shrinks from secluding himself in fens or in holding clay among clodhoppers. He is fond of shooting, and half the squires in such or such a county are only too glad to have him at their battues. He likes hunting, and one of the pleasures of a farmer's life is that you should be able to mount yourself occasionally; so of course a tolerable hunting county and the vicinity of a pack are elements to be considered in his choice. In brief, for one reason or another, it is highly improbable that he risks his small capital where it is most certain to bear the richest fruit, and ten to one that the inducements which have guided his choice turn out lifelong snares to him. With the strictest attention and the closest economy he can earn but small interest on his money at best; it is impossible to make a fortune out of one hundred and fifty to two hundred acres. If he means to make the best of it, he must dispense with a bailiff, and save the high wages which a man in that position would demand. If he prudently becomes his own master, he must make up his mind to an existence of sustained self-sacrifice. He must put his own hand to the plough, and look after his affairs with unceasing vigilance—vigilance all the more needful that Hodge, although he may be dull and slow, is swift enough to take advantage of a "young 'un." If he accepts an invitation to a shooting party—and one acceptance makes many—he is likely to find practical illustration of the adage that the mice play when the cat is away. He scarcely likes to accept promiscuous hospitality without occasionally returning it in some shape or another. Now and then he offers a quiet dinner and a rubber to his old friends and schoolfellows in the neighbourhood. "You must take me in the rough, you know," he says; and so they do, and he serves chickens from his own barn-door, and a pigeon-pie from the dovecot, and game which he carried home from the last battue. But there are legs of mutton, too, at 1*s.* a pound, and men must drink as well as eat, and what would his neighbour Hopkins think of his prospects at the end of the year were he to lavish his hard-won substance on such riotous living? The match between the two men is not equal. Hopkins lives little better than his labourers, and never spends a sixpence without looking at it twice. Our friend has the tastes and the generosity of a gentleman; he always had plenty of pocket-money at school, and he associates familiarly with brothers and cousins who are men of fortune. He cannot higgie over a bargain. It is odious to him to stand out for half-crowns when replenishing his pastures or disposing of his surplus stock. Hopkins, on the other hand, long before he married and begot his large family, had mastered the useful maxim about pence and pounds. By practising it consistently and conscientiously he has laid by something for a rainy day, and, thanks to his comfortable balance at the county bank, can support a bad season with a certain cultivated stoicism. Our friend is naturally a generous fellow enough, and would have taken money matters easily had his lot been a different one. As it is, how these bad seasons wear him! Tremendous drought for two consecutive years, and though the wheat stands it well, thanks to the depth of the soil, he has to part with his young stock for a song in the utter dearth of herbage. The next spring is a splendid one, and fields and meadows are waving with luxuriant herbage. He must either see the grass he rents so dearly run to waste, or go into a market where all are buyers, to repurchase at fancy prices the stock he was forced to fling away. Or he sees the heavens open and the floods descend in a deluge in hay-time. Or the wind is howling and driving the rain against his windows, when his full-eared fields are bending ready for the reapers. We say nothing of hops and fancy crops like these, which are never safe from blight and fly and weather till they are passed through the kiln, which glut the markets in a good year, and in a bad one are swamped nowadays in an avalanche of importations from Germany and America. What with strange diseases threatening his cattle, and the vicissitudes of an English

climate imperilling his crops, he has quite sufficient cause for anxiety in the ordinary routine of a farmer's life. We do not say that he may not have chosen wisely. He may have the qualities necessary for success, although his utmost success will be but a competence sufficient for a man of simple habits. But we do say that he should weigh things well before committing himself, and when he has committed himself, he should remember that he can do no better than take the worthy Hopkins for his model in many things.

For ourselves, were the decision still to be made, with every sympathy for our friend's tastes, we should certainly be inclined to turn our thoughts to emigration. It is true that the days are past when rapid fortunes were almost a certainty in Australia. Farming in countries like the Canadas yields good profits, but not great ones. The competition in Western America is excessive, and in some ways native-born Americans have decided advantages, nor is their company in every way desirable. There are raids from Indians, and disagreeables of climate, if you take to cattle-breeding in Buenos Ayres and on the Plata. But all that only means that no state of life is without its drawbacks. Abroad the field is a wide one, and there is an ample variety of choice. With ordinary prudence, a competence is assured to begin with. You separate yourself with more or less of a wrench from extravagant habits and associations; but, the wrench once over, it is astonishing how little it pains you. You have more excitement, and excitement of a much less anxious kind, and you can usually indulge yourself moderately in some sort of field-sport with a clear conscience. Above all, you always have some hope of drawing a prize, and making a reasonable fortune. You can marry with less anxiety as to the future of your children. Nor need you risk your little capital at once, and lose it before you have learned experience. In Australia, at least, trustworthy superintendents are always sought after, and wealthy squatters are glad to employ gentlemen, whose society is invaluable to them. There may be, and often are, circumstances that make it worth one's while to content oneself with a bare competence in England; but you have usually better chances if you seek your fortune further afield.

#### LORSCH.

ONE of the most memorable spots in early German ecclesiastical history seems to be almost forgotten even in its own land. The name of the famous Abbey of St. Nazarius at Lauresheim has been, by some unlucky process, cut short into Lorsch, and in uttering the word *Lorsch* it is needful to frame the one syllable with great distinctness, lest it should be mistaken for the now better known name of *Lorch*, which is to be found in every guide-book. The place is easy to get at, the one object which it contains is of an almost unique interest, yet even very intelligent people seem to know hardly anything about it. It is indeed quite possible that a scholar may have worked with some profit at the *Annales Laureshamenses*, *Lauresenses*, and the like—the spellings are endless, and Lauresheim turned out more than one set of Annals—and yet he may hardly recognize the place of their birth if any chance should carry him by the petty station of Lorsch, on a newly-finished branch railway which joins Worms with the line between Heidelberg and Darmstadt. He may have read in those Annals one of the most authentic versions of the process by which the Frankish King was first changed into the Roman Emperor, and he may yet fail to call to mind that in the obscure village which he is passing by there still remains one of the few undoubted architectural monuments of the reign of Charles, a monument most likely of that stage of his reign when Rome knew him only as her Patrician and not yet as her Caesar. The village may be reached by a walk either from the station of its own name or by a longer walk from the larger station of Bensheim on the greater railway. One of the last buildings which the traveller reaches in the former case, one of the first which he reaches in the latter, standing out boldly in the midst of the village street, is the building which makes Lorsch known at least to every student of the history of architecture—the almost unique fragment, quite unique, we believe, in its own part of the world, of a great monastery consecrated in the latter half of the eighth century. The greater Annals of Lauresheim, which are so important a source of the general history of the time, seem not to stoop to record the local history of Lauresheim itself. But the lesser Annals and the local history tell us how in 776 King Charles, coming back from his first Italian expedition, not yet Caesar and Augustus, but already King of the Franks and Lombards and Patrician of the Romans, came to attend the ceremony of the dedication of the church of St. Nazarius and the translation of the body of the martyr. The monastery was then newly founded, but, through its possession of the relics of St. Nazarius, it was already growing into importance. The famous Chrodegang of Metz, the author of the canonical rule which English bishops found it so hard to enforce at Wells and Exeter, and whose honorary title of Archbishop seems to have led at least one editor to confound *Melita* with *Moguntia*, came back from Rome in 765, the year before his death, with the bodies of three martyrs, Gorgonius, Nabor, and Nazarius, of whom the third alone concerns us. In the land beyond the Rhine—it is a Metz historian who is speaking—a godly woman, whose name appears in Latin as *Chilliswindia*, with her son Cancro, had already dedicated her estate at



Lauresheim to the protomartyr Stephen. From the local Chronicle, and from an incidental notice in the universal Annals of Sigebert, we find that this godly woman and her son were personages of more exalted earthly rank than might have been thought from the way in which they were spoken of at Metz. Cancro was an illustrious Count, and the elect lady Chilliswindis was the widow of Count Rupert, Cancro's father and predecessor in office. Their zeal however did not descend to Heimeric, the son of Cancro, who made a vain attempt to get back the lands which his father and grandmother had given to the Saints. The lands of Lauresheim lay not only in the province, but in the diocese, of Moguntia or Mainz, but Chilliswindis and Cancro in some way placed their new foundation under the care and protection of their benefactor Chrodegang. It may be that this act of theirs in calling in the prelate of Mettis may have helped to strengthen the memorable confusion by which Boniface has been not only described, but edited, as Archbishop of the see of Chrodegang. To Chilliswindis, then, Chrodegang gave one-third of his treasures—namely, the body of St. Nazarius. In his honour a goodly church was built at Lauresheim ("edificata in honore ipsius martyris miri decoris basilica"), and, after Chrodegang was dead, the new church of St. Nazarius was hallowed, and his body translated to its new shrine, in the presence, as we have seen, of no less a spectator than King Charles himself.

Of the monastery which was then built we have an undoubted portion actually remaining. This is the famous gateway, which in later, but still early times, seems to have been changed into a chapel, the two uses being of course in no way inconsistent with one another. The building stands almost alone as a work of the reign of Charles himself. There is of course his own church at Aachen, but that has undergone far greater changes, and much of its splendour was owing to the marble columns which Charles brought away from Ravenna. The gateway at Lorsch, on the other hand, a humbler work in itself, remains almost wholly untouched, and it was more strictly, so to speak, built on the spot where it stands. We see in it a reproduction of Italian forms, and we may feel certain that it was largely the work of Italian craftsmen; but there is nothing to suggest that any part of the fabric itself was, as we know was the case at Aachen, brought from any other spot. It is hardly possible that such a translation as took place in the case of Aachen could take place in the case of Lorsch. At Lorsch there are no columns standing free which could be carried about from place to place, like those which were probably brought from some unknown spot to the palace of Ravenna, and which were then carried from Ravenna to Ingelheim, and from Ingelheim to Heidelberg. The ornamental features at Lorsch consist, not of detached shafts, but of half-columns against the wall, forming an inseparable part of the building. Herein lies the architectural peculiarity of the Lorsch gateway; it consists of two stages, seemingly of one date, and yet in what we may fairly call two styles of architecture. The lower stage at once strikes us by its singularly classical character. It is Roman or Italian rather than Romanesque, even of the most classical type. It seems like a going back even from the buildings of Spalato and Ravenna. Three plain round arches, which of course form the main constructive features of the building, are divided by half columns, set Italian fashion against the wall, finished with composite capitals and supporting what may pass for an entablature. It is in fact an example of the unreal mode of building which distinguishes the classical Roman and the revived Italian from the honest construction alike of Grecian, Romanesque, and Gothic. The construction is not enriched but masked. The three arches, the real constructive features, are left plain, while ornament is sought for in the decorative forms of another construction. No doubt decorative shafts supporting an entablature do occur ever and anon, even in much later work. But they are commonly on a much smaller scale, and form part of the minuter enrichment, while these at Lorsch are as prominent as in any revived Italian building which makes an incongruous whole out of Roman arches and Grecian entablatures.

The feeling in looking at this lower stage is one of wonder that anything so classical could have been made in Germany in the year 776 or thereabouts. Our wonder is increased when we compare the lower stage with the upper. The contrast is such that it really looks as if it were designed, as if two sets of workmen of different tastes had been allowed to carry out their several fancies in the upper and the lower stage of the building. This upper stage is exactly like some of our so-called "Anglo-Saxon" buildings less rudely wrought. It is in fact Primitive Romanesque, while the work below is classical Roman. It consists of an arcade of nine arches, if the word arches be not a bull when their sides are straight, the form being exactly the same as in the well-known English examples at Deerhurst and the two Bartons, only less roughly and clumsily worked. The shafts, like those in the inside of the tower at Deerhurst, are fluted, but they have not the squat heavy form of those at Deerhurst; they are much lighter, and are finished with a capital barbarous enough, but which evidently means to be Ionic, and that not Roman, but like the pillar in the crypt at Fulda, Grecian Ionic. Every third arch of the series has a small plain round-headed window pierced under it. No contrast can be more striking than that between these two stages; they look as if they might be centuries apart from each other, and yet there is nothing in the construction or masonry to show that there is any difference of date. The angles and cornices seem to show that the whole is one design; and a system of enrichment, stones wrought in ornamental patterns, is carried over the whole building. Our only guess can be that there really was a

kind of compromise of styles; that for the lower stage, where the architectural features are on a greater scale, Italian workmen were employed, while in the less important range above it native workmen were allowed to follow their own fancies.

The outside of this front facing the west seems to be wholly untouched, except that the three great arches have been built up, and the preservation in which it still remains is truly wonderful. To the east a staircase has been added, which hides part of the lower cornices, and within an arch, in a later form of Romanesque, more like our Norman than is usual in Germany, has been inserted as a kind of reredos to an altar. But in all its essential features we have the building as it stood in the days of Charles. It is of course possible, and even likely, that the gateway may be somewhat later than the ceremony of 776, as the church may have been consecrated, and the remains of the patron Saint translated, before all the buildings of the Abbey were finished. In fact, we should be rather inclined to give it a slightly later date. Charles came to the consecration of the church on his return from Italy; the first Abbot, Gundeland, came to him at Speier to ask for his presence at the ceremony, when the church was already finished ("perfecta jam templi fabrica et, ut domum Dei decebat, omni specie decoris exornata"). The gateway one would rather conceive to be the work of Italian workmen, either brought with him then or sent for at some later time, perhaps when the marble columns were brought from Rome and Ravenna. And the local history seems to help us to a probable date. Abbot Richbodo, who ruled the Abbey from 784 to 805, holding it, as it would seem, during the last half of his reign in plurality with the Archbishopric of Trier, is recorded to have made great improvements in the domestic buildings, rebuilding some of them in stone which before were of wood ("destructis ligneis domibus, in quibus fratres eatenus commanebant, in aquilonali videlicet parte, claustrum muris circumdans ad meridianam partem uti nunc videtur transiit; dormitorium quoque cum ecclesia triplici fecit"). The time of Richbodo's rule would seem to be a likely time for the building of the gateway. That the building is really of the Caroline age there seems no reason to doubt. Unlike as its two parts are to one another, they are still more unlike anything else. The gateway of Lorsch stands as an almost unique monument of a great time, and it is perhaps all the more striking standing as it is, neither in the midst of a great city nor amid the desolation of a ruin; but suddenly coming on the eye in the street of a village which contains no other object on which the eye cares to rest.

The one perfect thing at Lorsch is the gateway. Of the other buildings of this great monastery nothing remains except a desecrated fragment of the church, a few bays of the nave, with the aisles pulled down and the arches built up. But this is no part of the building consecrated in 776. The simplicity of the work, showing nothing but square piers and plain round arches, might lead the inexperienced observer to set it down as more ancient than the far more elaborate gateway. But this is one of the many cases which, like our own Durham, teach us that mere richness and plainness, mere goodness and badness of work, are by no means unerring guides to the dates of buildings. The older and more splendid church of Lauresheim was burned in 1090, and its precious decorations and ornaments were destroyed ("repentino ac miserabili incendio tota Laureshamensis ecclesia conflagavit, illasque regum ac principum nobiles et veteres operas et impensas, parietes auro argenteoque pretextos, fornices marmore, ebore, gemisque interinctos, preciosas purpure copiosasque subpellectilem, omne denique quod pulchrum erat visu, cum circumpositis sedificiis edax flamma favillatenus absorbit"). The writer goes on to speak in the usual exaggerated language of every part of the whole monastery being destroyed; but it is plain that the gateway at least escaped; no one can believe for a moment that that is later than 1090. What is specially to be noticed is that the church was rebuilt with the utmost speed, but in a form which was confessedly inferior to what had been before ("in brevi tum ex oblati impendiis, tum ex incendii reliquiis, eadem restaurata est ecclesia, et si non ea qua olim miræ venustatis elegantia, tamen prout facultas subpetebat et temporis indulsit festinantia"). The tradition of the eleventh century, recorded by a writer of the twelfth, that its own work was inferior to that of the eighth, is a thing to be borne in mind. Yet we have the same paradox in our own land. Some of our own Primitive buildings, the works of Wilfrith for instance, if not actually better in workmanship, clearly affected a greater amount of enrichment than the earliest Norman buildings. Strange to say, the church thus built up with all speed after 1090 remained unconsecrated till 1130, when it was hallowed by Adalbert, Archbishop of Mainz, and four other Bishops. But just in the same way many of our own great churches remained unconsecrated in the middle of the thirteenth century, and, according to the man who knows most about it, the present church of Lincoln has never been consecrated yet.

The Abbey of Lauresheim constantly figures in early German history. Lewis the German, and his son of the same name, were both buried in the same church of St. Nazarius, and an empty sarcophagus is still shown in the gateway as having once held the remains of the first sovereign of the distinct German Kingdom. Under Otto the Great we read how a rich Count tried to persuade the King to apply the revenues of the rich monastery to the purposes of his wars, and how the future restorer of the Empire resisted the temptation. But if Otto refused to alienate the lands of the monks of Lauresheim, he did not refuse to make use of their hospitality; and in 939 we find his Queen, the English Edith, tarrying at the Abbey while her husband went to the Lotharingian

war. A hundred and thirty years later we find the faithful wife of Henry the Fourth quartered on the house in a like manner, while the King was going to and fro on the affairs of his kingdom. We read ever and anon of the abbatial staff of Lauresheim being conferred by the royal hand, and of the Abbey being at one time annexed to the see of Worms, and at another forming part of the vast possessions of the famous Adalbert of Bremen. This last piece of plurality the historian of Lauresheim naturally deplores, while Adam of Bremen seems to look on it in the light of an honourable foreign conquest. The detailed history of the house reaches till 1179, and towards the end we read how Abbot Henry, who reigned from 1148 to 1166, enriched the house with splendid gifts, adorned the church and the other buildings with pictures and ornaments, and rebuilt the circuit of the precinct wall. There is nothing which points to any change in the essential fabric either of the church or of the gateway. The perfect gateway of the eighth century, the fragments of the church of the eleventh, still remain, one of them an almost unique monument of the days which were the turning point in the history of Germany and Europe, and both joining to establish the truth in the history of the building art, that there are times when the skill of the craftsman instead of advancing falls back.

#### ANGLICANS AND OLD CATHOLICS.

THE loneliness of the Old Catholic position is having its natural result in a feverish effort to make friends on all sides. To maintain the attitude which its leaders first took up would have required an extraordinary amount of self-reliance. Membership of the Roman Church "as not yet altered by the Vatican decrees" proved on experiment to be membership of a very small body. A few scattered congregations in Germany represent on this theory the whole Catholic Church. All the rights and privileges of that vast organization have vested in certain priests and professors who have not been able to secure the countenance of a single bishop, and are acting in apparent defiance of every canon of ecclesiastical discipline. That the Old Catholics should contentedly remain in this position was more perhaps than could be expected of human nature. At all events it was more than human nature has shown itself capable of in their case. Their overture to the Jansenist Church of Holland was the first instance of their desire to form new links with external Christendom. The invitation sent to certain Anglican divines to attend the Old Catholic Congress which opened at Cologne yesterday is a second attempt in the same direction. The immediate fruit of this last effort has been seen in letters from the Bishop of Lincoln and the Dean of Westminster. It is possible that when the Old Catholic leaders come to study these documents, and to listen to the speeches framed in the same sense which the writers of them will deliver at the Congress, they may be led to doubt the wisdom of the policy which they seem inclined to adopt. Christian unity is an admirable object for any religious body to propose to itself, but its attainment implies agreement either upon methods or results. The Bishop of Lincoln and the Dean of Westminster can but carry abroad the differences which have so often parted them at home. The gulf between the Pope and the Old Catholics is scarcely wider than that which separates the two Anglican divines. Their estimates of the nature of the Old Catholic movement are radically opposed. The Bishop of Lincoln sees in it—at all events he tries hard to see in it—a reproduction of the English Reformation, not as it lived in history, but as it lives in his devout imagination. He first draws a picture of the Church of England in which no eye but his own can recognize any resemblance to the actual institution, and then propounds it for the imitation of all assembled at the Congress. "We, the Church of England"—a "We" which must be taken as an example of the *We Royal*, the meaning obviously being, "I, the Church of England"—"covet no novelties in matters of faith." Certainly, considering how richly the Church of England has of late years been provided with novelties in matters of faith, it would argue more than common greed if she still coveted them. "No," he goes on, "we altogether detest them." It is doubtful whether the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council would altogether accept this statement, and if we do not mistake, the Bishop of Lincoln himself has from time to time taken up his parable against doctrines which have obtained recognition in the Church of England without, in his judgment, being able to make good their pedigree. "If we ourselves shall have been found to have declined from true Catholic antiquity in matters which are necessary to everlasting salvation, we do not refuse to be called back by you to the rule of the Primitive Church—nay, we ardently desire it." If the Bishop is speaking of himself in this passage, all that can be said is that it would be an extremely rash Old Catholic who presumed to prove to him that he has declined from true Catholic antiquity. The Bishop's answer to the demonstration would be modelled in substance, if not in form, on the Archbishop of Granada's speech to Gil Blas:—"I don't at all take it ill that you speak your sentiment; it is your sentiment only that I find bad. I have been most egregiously deceived in your narrow understanding."

If, however, the Bishop claims to speak on behalf of the Church of England, it is incumbent on him to reconcile his description of her attitude towards "true Catholic antiquity"

with the language of the Dean of Westminster. The latter bases his sympathy with the Old Catholic movement on its representing the "paramount duty . . . of endeavouring to bring the worship, the teaching, and the practice of the Church into conformity with that higher aspect of Christianity which Divine Providence has brought home to us by the experience of history, by the spirit of science, by the increased knowledge of the Bible and spread of knowledge, and by the growth of morality and civilization." If the Old Catholics were to call back Dr. Stanley to the "rule of the Primitive Church," instead of ardently desiring it, he would parry the thrust by a reference to the "higher aspect of Christianity." What are the Old Catholics to say to the Church of England in the presence of such opposite versions of her wishes and purposes? Are they to go back with the Bishop of Lincoln, or to go forward with the Dean of Westminster? If they take the former course, they had better come over to England in the body as well as in the spirit, for the peculiar type of Anglicanism represented by Dr. Wordsworth is too strictly insular to bear a sea voyage. If they follow Dr. Stanley, they are landed in another difficulty. The Dean has no desire to bring over the Old Catholics either to England or to Anglicanism. On the contrary, he sees in the movement a consciousness that the "amelioration of Churches can best be accomplished, not by deserting them, and so leaving them a prey to indifference or fanaticism; not by founding new sects, which will probably become narrower than the Churches; but by developing whatever germs of good and true are to be found in the national institution which already exist." It is no doubt true that the Old Catholics have not tried to ameliorate the Roman Church by deserting it, for the Roman authorities have saved them the trouble of making up their minds on the point by turning them out. But whether a man deserts his Church or is ejected from it, he is equally outside it as regards his power of developing any germs that may exist in it. The Dean of Westminster writes as though the position of the Old Catholics in the Church of Rome were identical with his own position in the Church of England. The Archbishop of Munich would tell a different story. What is the "existing national institution" within and for which Old Catholics are to work? Nobody can turn Dr. Stanley out of the Church of England, unless indeed he should insist on presenting the "higher aspect of Christianity" in words which have been actually condemned by the Privy Council. Consequently, there is no impediment to his developing anything he likes in the institution to which he has the good fortune to belong. But the relation of the Old Catholic to the Roman Church rather resembles the relation of Mr. Voysey to the Church of England. He was willing to develop and ameliorate the institution in which he found himself, only the institution in question declined to be developed or ameliorated by him. That is precisely what the Roman Catholic authorities have done in the case of the Old Catholics, and this action on their part certainly makes it difficult to continue the process by which the Dean of Westminster sets so much store.

The truth is that the Old Catholic leaders have made a mistake in becoming prematurely active. Their true policy was to limit the quarrel between them and the Pope to the one question of infallibility. Any extension of the controversy is sure to be regarded by the great body of Catholics as an *ex post facto* justification of their expulsion from the Church. After all, it will be said, the Pope was right when he declared that those who refused to accept the Vatican decree were no better than Protestants. We thought he was hard on them till we saw what company they keep. Now that they have allied themselves with Father Hyacinthe, who breaks a vow voluntarily taken and held sacred by the Church for thirteen centuries at least, for no other reason than because he has fallen in love; with Jansenists, who were declared in schism on grounds which, whether true or false, had no connexion with the definition of infallibility; and with English Protestants, who have never yet been able to agree among themselves, there is nothing more to be said for them. The Old Catholics, as it seems to us, have really laid themselves open to this sort of criticism. The primary function they had to discharge—primary in order of time at all events—was to show that it was possible for men to hold out against the tyrannical imposition of a new article of faith without in any other way ceasing to be their old selves. The self-given description of them to which Dr. Wordsworth takes exception—members of the Roman Church "not yet altered by the Vatican decrees"—is evidence that their original conception of their position had nothing of that comprehensive character which now seems to attach to it. We say nothing as to the relative merit of the two theories considered in themselves. The motive which led the Old Catholic leaders to set themselves against a novel definition was not, as we understand it, the restoration of unity between Christians within the pale of the Roman Church and Christians outside it. It was rather the maintenance of the integrity of the Roman Catholic Church itself, the demonstration in their own persons that, no matter what consequences might follow, they would assert the paramount importance of identity of doctrine over all other identities whatever. If their negotiations with other Christian bodies are to have any result, the identity of doctrine with the Roman Church as it was before the Vatican decrees must soon be at an end. They may claim identity with the Roman Church as it was before the Council of Trent, as it was before the separation of the East and West, as it was in the days of the Apostles, as it would have been if it had adopted the principles of the English Reformers, as it



might be if it were ameliorated by Dr. Stanley's "higher aspect of Christianity." But none of these identities will give any special title to the name of Old Catholics, or serve to differentiate them from the common body of Protestants. The importance of the movement in other ways may continue or increase, but the peculiar interest which originally attached to it will be gone.

#### THE RAILWAYS AND THE PUBLIC.

ANYBODY who has been compelled to wait at a railway station, and, for want of anything better to do, has studied the threatening array of by-laws placarded on the walls, must have been struck by the astonishing number of offences and misdemeanours which a person of moderate enterprise and activity might easily commit in a very short space of time. Indeed, it would appear to be almost as difficult to pass through a railway station without doing something or other to render oneself liable to be given into custody and carried before a magistrate for summary conviction as to dance blindfold among eggs without breaking any of them. To add to the terror of nervous passengers, select examples of the condign punishment inflicted on unfortunate people who have been caught in the meshes of this Draconic code are recorded in a series of gloomy handbills. Until recently it was the custom of the railway authorities to pillory their victims in this manner, with their full names and addresses, for months or perhaps for years afterwards. But a lawsuit taught them that this was dangerous sport, and they have now to be content with the vague indication of initials. A traveller whose mind was not too much depressed by the dismal prospect of innumerable fines and penalties, and who had the courage to read all the by-laws and other announcements to the end, would probably be still more surprised to find that, while passengers are liable at almost every step to be pounced upon as criminals, the Railway Companies proclaim themselves to be absolutely free from all the obligations of contract, and from every kind of legal responsibility. There used to be an old ceremony called "Swearing on the Horns at Highgate," by which persons undertook to do all sorts of things, subject to the condition that they were not to be bound to do them unless they liked. This would seem to have been the precedent upon which the Railway Companies based their conception of their duties to their customers. It need hardly be said that it is not always possible to shake off legal responsibility by the simple process of repudiating it; but railway officials are sagacious enough to understand the disposition of most people to take for granted whatever is constantly asserted in a very solemn and positive manner. The liabilities which have already been established against the railways by judicial decisions might, we suspect, be considerably extended if people who could afford it would invariably make a point of bringing the Companies to book for every instance of *laches* in a Court of law. Of course it would be a highly expensive amusement, and would require to be backed by a long purse. The Companies would be certain to drag each decision through as many Courts as possible, and to pile up costs, and in the end the suitor, whatever might be the result, could hardly hope for any personal advantage. Under the circumstances, it is not perhaps surprising that so many of the obligations of the railways are allowed to remain in misty obscurity; but public spirit could scarcely take a more useful form than in relentlessly prosecuting great corporations, whose wealth and influence place them too much above the law, for every default of duty. The railway interest is too strong in the House of Commons, we are afraid, for much to be expected from that quarter in the way of protection to the public; but Judges seldom err on the side of relaxing the obligations of contract, and juries might be trusted to support them. A few decisions would settle the law on a number of important points much better than an Act of Parliament, and we wish a few "true capitalists," as the Positivists call them, would take up the matter.

We have been led into these remarks by the correspondence which is now going on in the columns of the *Times* on the subject of railway unpunctuality. It is obvious that the indictment against the Companies is weakened by the absurdity and childishness of some of the complaints. A "Naval Officer," for example, is indignant because during the recent autumn manoeuvres the Salisbury trains were irregular in the hours of starting and arrival, and were frequently overcrowded. It is impossible that the ordinary routine of a railway can be smoothly conducted under such exceptional circumstances as are involved in the invasion of a quiet country district by a couple of armies and a still larger host of spectators. Another correspondent complains that his horses were delayed in their journey back to town from the same region. Anybody who goes about much by rail, and who takes the trouble to inquire into the causes of delay, must be satisfied that horse-boxes are one of the curses of railway travelling. The truth is, they ought not to be attached to passenger-trains at all, except between termini. In order to take on or to detach a horse-box the whole train has to be disarranged, and an awkward process of shunting gone through. It is desirable that everything should be done to facilitate the conveyance of horses, but ordinary passengers have obviously the first claim to consideration. When, however, the correspondence in the *Times* has been weeded of its absurdities, there is a solid residuum of grave complaint. Mr. Forsyth, who lives at Mortimer on the Great Western Railway, challenges that Company to publish a statement of the times of the actual arrival and departure of the

trains there during the last six weeks, side by side with the times advertised in their own bills. The trains, he says, are almost invariably late, and it is impossible to calculate how long a journey will last. The other day the engine broke down, and it was found that a goods engine with wheels of short diameter had been put to draw a quick passenger train, the result of the strain being that the spindles were bent and the train came to a standstill. It appears from another letter, that passengers for Tenby must be prepared, if their train is late, to spend the night at Whitland Junction. "R. D. F." gives his experience of the trains at Newbury:—Sept. 6, the 9.20 A.M. train was 45 minutes late; Sept. 9, 35 minutes late; Sept. 14, 55 minutes late; Sept. 15, 1 hour and 20 minutes late; on the 14th the Newbury train was 2 hours late at Paddington. A correspondent says he went to Paddington to meet the Weymouth express, due at 6 P.M.; it did not arrive till 7; the 5.5 train arrived at 6.5. Even on a short line like the London and Brighton, trains, it seems, are frequently an hour or more late. It would of course be unreasonable to suppose that trains should never, under any circumstances, fail to keep their appointed times. The most perfect arrangements are liable to occasional disturbance, and now and then delays are certain to occur. It is important, however, to observe that the gist of the complaint against the railways is not that trains are occasionally late, but that they are habitually, and, it may almost be said, systematically, late. The Companies publish time-bills which profess to give the hours at which their trains are timed to start and arrive; but these arrangements are, it seems, for the most part of a purely ideal character. Passengers are lured into a train on the faith of a promise that they shall be deposited at their destination at a specified hour; and there is clearly a breach of contract if they are detained for some hours beyond the time bargained for. The railways, it must be remembered, are quite free to time their trains as they choose, but there can be no reason why they should continue to publish false time-tables, except to delude the public. They fix their own hours, and they are bound to keep to them. If they cannot perform a journey between two points in less than an hour or two hours beyond the time they have fixed, they should alter their tables to correspond with the truth. There can be no possible excuse for habitual delays of an hour and more. If this happened only once in several months, it might be regarded as an accident; but if it happens day after day, with scarcely any intermission, it can only be said that the Company has publicly undertaken to do what it knows it cannot perform, or at least what it does not endeavour to perform. The mere inconvenience of having to sit a much longer time in the train than he expected is a very small part of the injury inflicted on the traveller. He has made all his arrangements on the strength of the Company's pledge that he shall be at a particular place at a particular hour. He may have to catch another train, or to fulfil an important engagement, but the delay upsets all his calculations.

There is another aspect of this question which must not be lost sight of. In Tuesday's *Times*, alongside of the letters containing complaints of the unpunctuality of the railways, there is a column headed "Railway Accidents." On Sunday morning there was a collision on the Midland Railway near York. The mail train with passengers ran into a goods train, but happily no one was killed. The mail, it is stated, was half an hour late at Normanton. On Monday there was a collision on the Caledonian Railway, not far from Glasgow. A goods train was being shunted when a passenger train came up and dashed right through it. A passenger was injured, but the engine-driver and stoker were killed. It may be presumed that as the passenger train was not expected at that moment, there was some irregularity as to time in this case also. The Railway Companies profess to work their lines in accordance with certain carefully prepared time-tables and working rules. Nothing in appearance can be more exact than the time-tables or more efficient than the rules. But it appears that, in point of fact, both time-tables and rules are equally ignored, and the securities of punctuality and organized precautions by which the safety of passengers is supposed to be secured are mere will-o'-the-wisps. When Mr. Bright presided at the Board of Trade, one of the Inspectors in a moment of honest indignation at a very shocking "accident," due entirely to culpable recklessness and systematic defiance of regulations, blurted out the truth about their working rules, and was sharply rebuked by his chief for hurting the feelings of Directors. The rules, it seems, are kept for production at inquests and in courts of law, but are not practically enforced; indeed violations of the rules are not only winked at, but encouraged, and men would be dismissed if they hesitated to break them when required. At Liverpool on Saturday an engine-driver was committed for trial on a charge of disobeying signals, whereby he had endangered the safety of passengers. It was urged for the defence that the practice of driving a light engine close behind a train was very common, and that though the signals were up the defendant was not told to stop at the various stations he passed, but, on the contrary, was "waved on by flags." It is impossible to say what is the worth of such a defence in this particular case; but no one can read the reports of the Board of Trade Inspectors without arriving at the conclusion that the higher officials of the Railway Companies practically work their lines in defiance of their own regulations.

It is idle to pretend that the delays which constantly occur in railway travelling are accidental. They are the natural and inevitable result of the deliberate acts of the Companies. We were lately rather more than three hours in doing a journey by railway which ought to have been done in less than two hours. The only

cause of delay was that the Company chose to detain our train at one point until a series of excursion trains came up, and tacked them on to the end of it. We travelled very slowly, and had to wait some time in order to discharge the excursionists at a station where, by the time-bills, the train ought not to have stopped at all. Nothing could be more deliberate than this, and it was of course a fraud upon the passengers. When railway delays are investigated, it will be found in the majority of cases that they arise simply because the Company has not made preparations to carry out its bargain, or has, to serve its own ends, done something which renders it impossible it can be carried out. If a passenger commits any offence against a Railway Company, he can be summarily tried and punished. The question is whether some equally simple and summary process cannot be placed at the service of the public to protect them against deliberate and systematic breaches of contract on the part of the railways. Or rather, perhaps, the question is whether the House of Commons is sufficiently independent to take the Companies in hand. If a traveller who has been detained on a railway could go before a magistrate and, on proof of the facts, obtain an order for the return by the Company of a certain proportion of his fare, according to the length of the detention, we should perhaps have fewer complaints of railway unpunctuality.

#### FALLACIES OF TEETOTALISM.

WE have lately received a little book bearing the above title, the writer of which has certainly the merit of taking the bull by the horns. He "elucidates the dietetic and medicinal virtues of alcoholic liquors" with a force and freedom at which the ladies and gentlemen of the Alliance will stand aghast. Amongst other things he tells us that "there are reasons for supposing that the Red Indians are the degenerated descendants of a tribe of ancient teetotallers who had emigrated to America to more effectually carry out their pledge of abstinence." We do not know what are the reasons for this curious supposition, but we think that the author is right in asserting that the use of alcohol, as it has accompanied, has also assisted, civilization. He fairly appeals to the teaching of the habits and customs of civilized nations. In the use of food and drink, he says, mankind are guided, not by learned dissertations or scientific formularies, but by the example of their ancestors, and by the gratification which eating and drinking bestows. It appears difficult to deny what this author affirms, "that alcoholic stimulants have acted an important part in the civilization and intellectual development of mankind." Nearly all great philosophers and poets, both ancient and modern, have either directly or indirectly recognized the civilizing influence of alcohol. "Like manure applied to barren soil, it often stimulates the mind to put forth stagnant powers." On the other hand, the teetotaler would allow the mind to remain altogether barren and unfruitful; would leave it to die of inanition or sleep away its existence, rather than that, by a generous diet, it should with many virtues originate some crimes. "If the doctrine of teetotalism had ruled before the Creation, the world never would have existed at all; but a total abstinence from life would have been prescribed as a cure for the ill which might arise from the presence of man." The Alliance, against which this author writes, has made much of the case of Sweden, where the use of alcohol prevails to a mischievous extent. But there is force in the retort that Sweden before the introduction of brandy was grossly barbarous. One of the most celebrated of those murderers and robbers who are called "sea-kings" was not more a prodigy of valour than a model of temperance, "and he composed an ode, which is still extant, in praise of raw flesh and toasted water." The case of ancient Greece seems to be a difficulty for the Alliance. "Its people not only enjoyed wine, but they looked upon it as a special gift of Heaven, as important as bread itself, and endowed with rarer qualities." This, as the writer truly says, has been the opinion of all civilized nations down to the present time. The Alliance, as we know, collects from week to week examples of accidents or crimes which it ascribes to the use of alcohol; but this author justly observes that no sufficient account is taken of its good effect. Marriage is generally considered to be socially beneficial, and it is promoted by the moderate use of alcohol, which inspires bashful men with the courage to make matrimonial proposals. Quarrels, some of which have arisen out of indigestion caused by over-eating, have been appeased by the influence of a cup of kindness. Public balls and private assemblies have been divested of stiffness, stolidity, and stupidity by the effect of alcoholic liquors judiciously distributed. This example will, we think, come home to the feelings of many a host and hostess whose imagination will be able to depict the difficulty of entertaining a party of teetotallers. Commercial disputes which threatened to end in litigation have been amicably arranged over a glass of grog. This item of the account would, we believe, be considerable. We have heard of a country solicitor, of high reputation in his district, who, when he was requested to undertake litigation, always commenced by inviting the intended plaintiff and defendant to dinner, and giving them as much good liquor as they could carry. This first step in the proposed suit was not unfrequently the last also. It is probable that domestic quarrels have likewise been felicitously terminated by the same benign influences.

This author deserves credit for his clear and sensible account of the circumstances under which alcohol is useful and even necessary. Under certain conditions of the body it may, he says, be better than either food or physic. We do not always want food; we rarely require physic. A glass of wine or beer may be useful refreshment when the stomach is not prepared for the reception of the one, and the system has need of the other. Excessive physical labour, long endurance of hunger, or anything which has a debilitating influence, more or less affects the appetite for solid food, and unfits the stomach for its reception. At such times alcoholic liquors are found to have a most beneficial effect upon some constitutions, both in affording present refreshment and in preparing the system for more substantial diet. To give beefsteak to a man enfeebled by a long continuance of hunger would be highly dangerous. A little brandy or wine quickly diffuses itself through the body, and infuses new life into every part, including, of course, the digestive organs, which are thereby invigorated for the reception and conversion of the food which is to follow. This is the treatment which has saved many a shipwrecked sailor, in the last stage of hunger, from the jaws of death, when beefsteak would have been a noxious and fatal poison. This description of the application of alcohol in cases of fatigue or hunger may be illustrated by reference to the experience of the present season in mountaineering. When an Alpine ascent is undertaken by a party of tourists, is it not thought a reasonable precaution to provide a supply of brandy? We do not speak now of specially difficult undertakings, but of an ordinary expedition by persons of fair bodily activity in the course of a month's holiday. It certainly does appear that the shopkeepers in Swiss towns expect to sell flasks adapted to contain brandy. There are doubtless teetotallers among successful mountaineers, but we think that it would appear that of all the persons who make a particular ascent in the course of a year, a large proportion take with them what is commonly called a pocket-pistol. Again, there is the class of persons who, without any specific disease, are unable from deficient power to digest at each meal sufficient food to exist upon. The habitual daily use of a small allowance of alcoholic drink bestows on this class the nervous energy in which they would otherwise be deficient. It is further pointed out by the author that the benefits conferred by alcoholic liquors are not the less real because their effect upon the system is less permanent than that of solid food. It is enough that an article intended to sustain life will serve the emergency of the hour, or even of the moment. The starved sailor, revived by a spoonful of brandy, is not the less saved because its effect is transient and it requires to be followed by diet better qualified to restore the body to its former strength. The virtue of alcoholic liquors lies very much in the quickness of their action. They do not require a long process of digestion, but are rapidly absorbed by and so refresh the system. When solid food is the best nourishment for the existing state of the body, it should be preferred to alcohol, but this in no degree diminishes the value of the latter in the performance of its own special function. It cannot be denied that alcoholic liquors are pleasant to the taste and agreeable to the stomach of the great majority of mankind. A hearer said to a teetotal lecturer, "You have convinced me of many things, but you have not convinced me that I do not like wine." The author contends that it is a fair presumption that the reasonable use of these liquors is beneficial. A single moderate dose, suitable for the individual case, produces effects which are limited to the viscera of the abdomen. Quicker and more powerful digestion, increased desire for meat and drink, and more abundant secretions, are the common phenomena which result from the lowest degree of this action. A large quantity, or several small doses repeated at short intervals, extend the action of alcohol to the spinal cord, the brain, and the entire nervous system. The pulse is raised, becomes more powerful and quicker; all muscular actions take place with more ease, strength, and capacity of endurance; the tone of the nervous system is raised, the influence of the nervous energy upon the other organs is quicker and more powerful. "Above all, that part of the nervous system whose functions are executed by the brain is most perceptibly increased, as is seen in the greater cheerfulness, humour and courage, as well as the more active and acute power of thinking." We transcribe this passage from the author, who has transcribed it from the *National Cyclopaedia*. It amounts to nearly the same thing as Falstaff's well-known discourse in praise of a good sherries-sack, which, as he says, "hath a twofold operation in it." We will not quote a familiar passage, but it seems fair to say that Shakespeare has expressed with his usual felicity of language the common experience of mankind as to the beneficial effect of the moderate use of alcohol.

It is this concurrent testimony, which is given *semper, ubique, ab omnibus*, that creates to our mind the great difficulty of the Alliance. Take all the ancient and modern literature of the world, and consider how far the production of it has been caused or influenced by alcohol. If the Alliance were to publish a collection of all the works that have been written by teetotallers, we doubt whether the library so formed would attract many readers. Within most people's experience the brain, when engaged in intellectual labour, seems to require to be stimulated or otherwise assisted either by wine, spirit, tea, coffee, or tobacco. Of course we shall be told that tea is not an "intoxicating" drink; but, if taken in excess, it is not much less injurious than wine. It may perhaps be in many cases a desirable substitute for wine; but in general discussion it ought to be remembered that the ancients could only choose between wine and water, and it seems extravagant to con-



tend that they ought to have confined themselves to water. But if wine was good for them, it cannot be very bad for us. It seems a pity that the writers for the Alliance cannot put themselves under the care of Mr. Cook, and go for a tour in France and Germany. In England it is perhaps conceivable that any result may be attained by persistent agitation. But you might as well forbid the Rhine or Moselle to flow towards the sea as attempt to extirpate the vines growing on their banks. And the hop would be found equally ineradicable in Bavaria. But all this vast production implies an enormous number of consumers. It is difficult to say whether the prevention of production or of consumption would be the more hopeless task. Yet the Alliance will maintain itself in defiance of this exposure of its "fallacies," and will continue to agitate as if it really believed itself capable of abolishing the liquor-trade.

#### PRIESTS IN COURTS OF LAW.

THE Criminal Court of Brest has given its judgment in the case of the Jesuit Dufour and the Viscountess de Valmont. We have had the advantage of contemplating this "monument of jurisprudence," which, however, a Court of Appeal may possibly reverse; and we have endeavoured to imitate the beautiful example of the crowd outside the Court-house at Brest, which, according to the newspapers, showed itself full of calm and dignity on hearing of an acquittal where it had expected a conviction. The Brest Tribunal elaborately discussed the question of the credibility of the only witness of the alleged misconduct of the defendants. This witness was Kergroën, the conductor of a railway train in which the defendants travelled. He stated that the station-master at Châteaulin had hinted to him that "intimate relations" probably existed between the defendants, and he set himself to watch them. The time was after 9 P.M., and the defendants occupied an imperfectly lighted carriage. The conductor, after peeping through the window, and observing certain proceedings which he describes, "judged the moment opportune" for entering the carriage. On reproaching the defendants for the impropriety of their proceedings, Dufour excused himself and the lady by alleging that they were brother and sister, and had not met for a long time. This was the substance of the evidence, and the Tribunal proceeded with suitable solemnity to contrast it with the statement of the defendants. We will not, for fear of doing injustice, attempt to translate the admission which they are reported to have made, that, "dans un moment d'expansion provoquée par un sentiment de reconnaissance, la tête de madame s'est penchée sur la tête de Dufour," and that this position was maintained for a few seconds. In presence of these two versions of the story, differing as they did in essential points, the duty of discovering the truth offered serious difficulties to the Tribunal. In the first place, the official at Châteaulin stated, not only that he had neither felt nor hinted any suspicion of the defendants, but also that "la modestie même du maintien de madame l'avait frappé." We think he did protest rather too much. Imagine an English station-master deposing that on the arrival of Lady X. at his station he was struck with the propriety of her demeanour. The conductor is found by the Tribunal to have acted under a preconceived suspicion, and to have been unable to observe "froideusement et impartialement" the proceedings which he describes. This, again, is rather beyond us. Supposing—which may the Gods avert!—that we were witnesses of such a matter, it might be difficult to preserve that coolness and impartiality which French law requires. However, in the result the Tribunal put aside the conductor's evidence, and proceeded only upon the admission of the defendants, which did not, in its judgment, amount to a punishable offence.

The Tribunal further held that the element of publicity was wanting; and this is a question of law upon which, as we understand, an appeal will be carried to a higher Court. It would appear that this question admits of being differently answered according as the English or American method of constructing railway carriages is adopted. Allowing, says the judgment, that a railway carriage where all persons may have places on payment is a public place, it ceases to be so from the moment that the train of which it forms part begins to move, since only a single person, the conductor, can have access to it. This would not be true of a train of carriages built on the American plan, so that each carriage would be accessible from the next. But as regards carriages built upon the plan with which we are most familiar, the decision of the Court is conformable to English law. In the absence of any special enactment, it would probably not be an indictable offence to commit the act charged against these defendants in a railway carriage occupied by themselves alone, even supposing that the conductor, if he found the moment opportune, could enter the carriage. In order to constitute an offence, it must be shown, not indeed that the proceedings of the defendants were seen, but that they might have been seen by several persons. If this be correct law, it follows that even if the Court had believed all that the conductor stated, it must still have acquitted the defendants. The local journals show by their comments that they expected a different result, but they exhort their readers to maintain that "sage attitude" of calmness and dignity which was assumed by the crowd on hearing of the acquittal. They remark with justice that the admission of Dufour furnishes sufficient ground for moral condemnation, and it may be added that

even if the Court had believed all that the conductor stated, it would still be doubtful whether a legal offence had been committed. According to the conductor, the moment which he deemed opportune for interference was anterior to the actual commission of the act which appeared to be contemplated. To put the matter shortly, the defendants admitted great indecency, the witness imputed greater, but did not allege the greatest. The defendants energetically denied all that they did not admit, but they did admit that in a moment of "expansion," and obeying a "sentiment de reconnaissance," there had been gross impropriety. It was stated by the conductor that when he reproached the parties for the attitude in which he found them, Dufour excused it by saying that he and Madame de Valmont were brother and sister, and that they had not met for a long time. The Tribunal notices this allegation of fraternity by Dufour, and makes on it the comment, "qu'une telle allégation n'eût certes pu venir à sa pensée s'il se fût agi d'acte d'impudicité." It is true that if Dufour had been in the position described by the conductor this would have been a very foolish thing to say, but it by no means follows that he would not have said it. Men often do and say very foolish things when they are surprised in the commission of discreditable acts, and thus they sometimes assist the course of justice which would otherwise be defeated. Let us, however, adopt the view which the Tribunal took of the facts, and there is quite enough in the case to merit severe reproof, and all the more because the law cannot reach it.

The Jesuits have lately been in trouble in more than one quarter. Simultaneously with the report of the Brest case we read of a prosecution at Brussels of a priest for forcing his way into a house where a sick man lay in need, as the priest considered, of spiritual ministration. The priest knocked at the door and inquired for the sick man, was told that he could not see him, and answered that he must, and thereupon pushed his way in. The sick man's wife sent for her son-in-law, "qui a sommé le père Smaelen de s'éloigner au plus vite." The son-in-law stated that when he came to the sick man's house he found in it M. Smaelen, who had the air of saying, "Je suis entré ici de par le droit divin, et l'on ne m'expulsera que par la force des baïonnettes." After assuring M. Smaelen, without effect, that the sick man could not be seen, the son-in-law sent for the police, and, as they did not arrive, "je dus me résigner à mettre M. Smaelen à la porte." After the witnesses had given their evidence, the public prosecutor summed up the case. Then the defendant's counsel addressed the Court; the public prosecutor answered him; and the defendant's counsel was again heard in reply. Lastly, the defendant himself explained to the Court that the sick man had been his tutor at the College of Ypres for two years, and had always been "très-ympathique" towards him, and had given him for a prize the complete works of Massillon. Hereupon the President requested the defendant not to occupy the Court with matters foreign to the case. We think that the President might perhaps have interposed rather earlier to restrain the exuberance of testimony against the defendant. An English judge would not allow a witness to state that a trespasser looked as if he could only be expelled at the bayonet's point. But in Courts conducted after the French mode some concession must be made to the supposed necessity for stage effect. In the result the defendant was convicted and sentenced to pay a fine of a hundred francs, or to be imprisoned for a month. The defendant appears to have erred through excess of zeal, and perhaps he may obtain at very moderate cost or inconvenience the reputation of having been in a limited way a martyr.

There has been another clerical case in which a French Protestant clergyman was prosecuted for offering insults to the Roman Catholic religion. To us who are familiar with the vigorous effusions of Dr. Cumming and Mr. Spurgeon, the polemical writing of the Rev. M. Steeg appears very poor stuff. There is nothing new or forcible in the article on a Corpus Christi procession for which he was prosecuted, and the only remarkable circumstance in the trial is that it should have taken place. It is true that the law forbids "insult," and a court of law has defined "insult" as any words that could shock the heart and conscience of a believer; and certainly we should think that M. Steeg's article, like much else that has been written on the subject, would have this effect. But if the writer is prosecuted, he or his counsel must be heard in defence, and unless the orator were very unskilful, he would contrive to enhance the effect of the writing which he defended. According to *Galignani*, the Court and audience remained for two hours spell-bound under the eloquence of M. Steeg; and, without accepting that statement in its full extent, it is manifest that the reverend orator made a very fair innings. The prosecution appears to have been instituted by the legal authorities in the usual way, and we have no means of knowing whether the Roman Catholic hierarchy approved of it. But perhaps they may infer from the result that it would be prudent if possible to let M. Steeg and his articles alone in future. Happily for them they have, and are likely to retain, the adherence of a large population which either cannot or will not read anything that can be written against their doctrines. Such scandals as that which occupied the Court at Brest must damage any Church in which they occur; but unfortunately all Churches are equally liable to be disturbed by what the Tribunal calls "la marche des passions humaines." As regards fervid orators like M. Steeg, there is this practical security against excess of language, that if they go too far, they are likely to get their heads broken by

devout believers in that which they denounce. As a matter of police it might be convenient to put a stopper on M. Steeg, but in the interest of the Roman Catholic religion a prosecution would appear unwise.

#### A RETROSPECT OF THE AUTUMN MANŒUVRES.

IF we are to derive substantial benefit from the annual manœuvres which, recently as they have been introduced, are already regarded as a permanent institution, it behoves us each year to subject them to a searching and thorough criticism. It is not enough to treat them as a whole, and to discuss whether, as a whole, they have gone off well or not; we must carefully examine every detail and ponder over every shortcoming with a view to ensuring an annual progress towards comparative perfection. The Prussians have practised these rehearsals of war for more than half a century, yet are never satisfied with what they have accomplished. They voluntarily continue *in statu pupillari*, and never cease to strive after further improvement. We are quite beginners at the game of war as carried on in peace, and have necessarily much to learn, more particularly as we have only vicarious experience of actual campaigns under the changed conditions of military science. Being at present but young apprentices as regards peace manœuvres, and theorists without a theory as regards real war in its modern shape, the nation must not be disappointed if we at first find that we are sadly wanting in many matters of the highest importance. The question is not therefore whether the British army is able to bear a comparison as regards tactics and organization with the forces of Continental Powers, but whether we are improving. Have the manœuvres of 1872 been more successful than those of 1871? are we in fact making progress? and what are the defects which demand a remedy?

As respects tactics, the answer is, we fear, not very satisfactory. There has certainly been a great difference in the handling of troops by some of the generals, but, on the whole, though on one side the columns were led up to the verge of fire with considerable skill, yet, once in action, the evolutions on both sides have been in many cases extremely faulty. The tactics of the battle-field have been loose, there has been a want of sufficient combination, and reserves have either been altogether wanting, not at hand when needed, or badly employed. The Northern army on three occasions occupied a position far too extensive for its strength. In two instances, when on the defensive, its commander, seeking to be prepared at all points, was weak at every one of them, while in the third instance he seemed to ignore the fact that the parallel order of attack is simply a relic of the feudal ages. Again, both armies when on the defensive have failed to deal counter-blows, and the three arms have not been harmoniously handled. Among the senior generals, two have sustained their previous reputations, while among the brigadiers several hitherto untried men have shown that they possess considerable aptitude for war. On the other hand, more than one of the commanders have confirmed previously existing suspicions that their abilities were not equal to their positions. On the whole, we are afraid it must be admitted that the manœuvres which have just terminated have not tended to give the nation an exalted opinion of the senior officers of the army. Passing to those of a lower rank—namely, the commanders of regiments—truth compels us to state that, excellent as most of them are on the parade-ground, they do not seem to be capable, as a rule, of applying drill to tactics, or of recognizing the recent changes in the art of war. As for any sustained systematic attempt to put into practice the lessons which were rehearsed before the opening of the campaign, battalions advanced deliberately in column under a close fire of artillery, and lines of skirmishers moved on open ground as coolly as if the breech-loading rifle had never been invented. There were a few exceptions, but, generally speaking, the only departure from the old system was to be seen in the extension of the supports; and cover was, in most cases, very slightly regarded. The Prussians, on the contrary, during their late manœuvres near Berlin, invariably avoided open and exposed spaces, being fully aware that in these days ground may be defended without being actually occupied. It is said that the highest military authority in this country disapproves of the idea of introducing even a modification of the Prussian system. As yet, however, he has not officially declared his views, or suggested any substitute for the evidently obsolete tactics hitherto practised by us. The consequence is that generals and commanding officers in a hesitating sort of way adopt different methods of fighting which are equally wanting in our old solidity and in Prussian pliancy. In short, we are still at sea as to the best method of handling infantry under fire; we possess, in fact, no recognized and uniform system of tactics whatever.

Neither are we much better off as regards cavalry. That arm has certainly been much better handled this year than it was twelve months ago, but as yet its commanders have only succeeded in obtaining an imperfect notion as to the proper method of employing it. Patrolling has been much practised, but not with sufficient freedom or method. When two armies are in the neighbourhood of each other, it is the duty of the cavalry never to cease to feel for the foe. If driven off at one place, it should re-establish its touch elsewhere, but at some one point the cavalry screen ought always to be in contact with the enemy. In most cases during the fights round Salisbury the patrols were sent

out almost exclusively in comparatively large bodies and only in particular directions. This was all very well, but the efforts of the large detachments to ascertain the movements of their opponents should have been supplemented by the incursions of, to use the German term, sneaking patrols, consisting of at most two or three dragoons. Had reconnoitring been carried on in this manner, Horsford's advanced guard would not have been surprised at Wilton, and would have become aware earlier on the same day of the real point of attack. In each army a regiment of cavalry was broken up for the purpose of acting with the infantry divisions, yet they altogether failed to afford the latter any co-operation. The nature of the ground was such that a single squadron of cavalry could in several places have quietly lain in ambush behind a swell or shoulder, and then have made a sudden swoop, returning to cover before the startled skirmishers could have fired more than one round. Not once did the cavalry attempt this feat. The idea of their commanders seems to have been that they had done enough if they engaged in theatrical tournaments which, whatever the issue, could have had but little effect on the result of the day.

The artillery have been much commended by some, and condemned by others. The fault-finders allege that the guns were not sufficiently concentrated, but they seem to forget that concentration of fire can be obtained without actual concentration of pieces. At the same time we cannot but think that the artillery have yet much to learn. In our opinion, they somewhat abuse their recently granted independence, and take up positions too distant from their mark. The Prussians content themselves with keeping just out of infantry fire, whereas our artillery during the manœuvres seldom approached the troops at which they were firing nearer than 2,500 or 3,000 yards. It is true that if the range is known, especially in the case of batteries acting on the defensive, who can mark out their ranges beforehand, guns fire as accurately at 2,500 yards as at half that distance. It must, however, be remembered that at the longer range the angle at which a shot falls is so great that it is not likely, if it misses the first time, to ricochet onwards and strike the supports. Besides, though fire may be accurate when the range is known, it is difficult when firing from a great distance to ascertain the range by trial shots. As to the Engineers, it is a matter of regret that they were so seldom allowed to take advantage of the opportunities which arose for constructing field bridges.

We have now pointed out most of the tactical shortcomings which have struck us, and it is only fair to indicate the pleas which may be urged in reply. The great difficulty with which the rival commanders had to contend was the "general idea," which proved a constant bugbear to them and gave rise to numerous misunderstandings. In order to allow due independence to the commanders, the "general idea" should have been limited to a statement of the supposed circumstances and object of each army. Instead of this, however, it included all sorts of paper forces, and thus reduced the rival leaders to the position of two opponents at chess each of whom is allowed to see only a portion of the board. In fact, Generals Walpole and Michel were required to combine open-air Kriegsspiel with actual field manœuvres. On the umpires devolved a most invidious, unpleasant, and difficult task, which they performed with rigid impartiality and considerable ability, as indeed might have been anticipated from a glance at the eminent names borne on the list. It is therefore with some diffidence that we hazard the opinion that in some instances they committed mistakes. For example, they do not seem always to have made sufficient allowance for the moral effect produced by a sudden and unexpected charge of cavalry. Again, it appears to have been considered that, if a battery fired at a body of troops, the latter must necessarily have been annihilated. It is well known, however, that a very heavy fire of artillery at an unknown and constantly changing range is often far more impressive than destructive. Take, for instance, the attack on St. Privat at the battle of Gravelotte. The village was but slightly fortified, yet the French stationed there held out against—first, the fire of 84 guns of the Prussian Guard, kept up for three hours; secondly, a determined infantry attack; thirdly, a two hours' fire of 120 guns at close range. Notwithstanding this *feu d'enfer*, Canrobert's corps only abandoned the position at last for want of ammunition. We maintain, therefore, that troops are not necessarily annihilated because they are for some time exposed to the distant fire of artillery. To assume the contrary is to assume that every shot tells. With regard to the umpires we may observe that they were too few in number, there being, without reckoning the Umpire-in-Chief, but fifteen for both armies. While on this subject we may be permitted to call attention to the fact that of those fifteen only six were infantry officers; surely an insufficient proportion, considering that battles are confessedly chiefly decided by infantry. From the umpires we naturally pass to the final decisions of the Umpire-in-Chief. The practice was for the Duke of Cambridge to assemble all the generals at the close of each day's operations, and, after hearing the reports and arguments of the umpires, to deliver his award, pointing out at the same time the errors which he conceived different officers to have committed. These open-air lectures were no doubt very instructive to those to whom they were given; but we are at a loss to understand why the subordinate officers and the rank and file were utterly ignored. To them the manœuvres were almost devoid of profit; for, save from common report or a subsequent perusal of the newspapers, they



gathered nothing even as to the result of the day's work, much less as to how the details had been carried out. It is difficult for actors in a performance to be interested if they are kept in ignorance of the views entertained of the method in which they played their part.

We have left ourselves but scant space for touching on one or two points which in our opinion are worthy of attention. The Control Department has decidedly improved since last year, and, if less hampered by the War Office, would probably have achieved a complete success. There have been complaints that salt pork of a very indifferent nature, supplemented only by biscuit, was issued with unnecessary frequency. It is a fact that when the pork was issued, potatoes were withheld. We should certainly have imagined that if these vegetables were deemed necessary adjuncts to fresh meat, they were still more required with salt meat. Whether the issue of the meagre and unsavoury rations in question was the act of the War Office or of the Control we cannot say, for it is one of the vices of our military system that it is difficult, if not impossible, to put the saddle on the right horse. Some very violent attacks have been made on the Guards. It has been loudly asserted that they were favoured and spared, and that any Militia regiment could "beat their heads off in marching." It has also been thrown in their teeth that they alone had mess marquees and carried mess carts about with them. Seeing that the Guards marched in one day twenty-five miles, it can scarcely be maintained that they were spared; and as to their style of marching, it may be safely asserted that they held their own with the most active corps in the force. Neither is it true, we are glad to say, that they were allowed to carry mess marquees about with them, for these were left behind at Blandford; otherwise we should not have hesitated to repeat the remarks which we made on this point a month ago. Again, as to the mess carts, many other corps were similarly provided. We may also mention that the Guards and the Artillery were particularly noticeable for strictness of discipline, men who fell out without leave on the line of march being tried by drum-head courts-martial. The discipline, indeed, of the whole force was admirable, the only exception being afforded by certain Irish Militia regiments. In one of the latter a private struck the adjutant's horse with the butt of his rifle; and in another a man threw his cap at the colonel, who contented himself with causing the missile to be solemnly burned in front of the corps. As for the Volunteer contingent, a single word must suffice; there can be no doubt whatever that they proved themselves worthy of taking a place in line by the side of the best corps in the army.

On the whole, it would not be true to say that the autumn manoeuvres have been a brilliant success. Many shortcomings have been apparent, and sufficient trouble has not been taken either to interest the troops or to enable them to derive from the operations all the instruction available. At the same time many useful lessons, much profitable practice, have been afforded. The institution is one of great and unquestionable value, and we cannot doubt that it will, with increasing experience, become more valuable every year.

## REVIEWS.

### FAYRER'S VENOMOUS SNAKES OF INDIA.\*

THE munificent patronage bestowed from time to time upon science, literature, and art by the Government of India has never perhaps been exercised with greater discrimination than in the case of Dr. Fayrer's valuable report upon the venomous snakes of the Indian peninsula. The execution of this large and handsome folio reflects the highest credit upon all concerned in it. The drawings of this graceful though deadly class of *Ophidia*, by native artists of the Government School at Calcutta, are as faithful to the originals as they are tasteful and refined in manipulation. Few things in nature are more striking to the eye than the mystery and the beauty displayed by this strangely marked order of creatures. Their sinuous and subtle coils, their weird and silent motion, their varied colouring, now dusky and dim, now glittering with every hue of the rainbow—above all, their deadly spring and stroke—have given them from the first a charm and a dread for all mankind; to which is added for men of science the interest which invests an order of life as yet but imperfectly known. No more beautiful specimens of snake life exist than the Indian cobra and viper, and never have we seen their beauty of form or colour depicted with greater truth and skill than in the coloured lithographs which illustrate Dr. Fayrer's report. The dull brown and buff of the common or hooded cobra, *Naja Tripudians*, the *Khoyah Gokurrah*, or *Dudia Keautiah* of the natives, or of the larger *Ophiophagus Elaps* (*Hamadryas*), nearly twelve feet in length, may inspire disgust, combined with fear; but in the black and golden bands of *Bungarus Fasciatus*, less boldly blended in *Platurus Fischeri*; in the vivid green of *Trimeresurus carinatus*, fringed with gold in *T. Erythrus*, and mottled with gold and black in *T. anamallensis*; in the tender mouldings of pale yellow and steel blue in *Hydrophis Coronata*; above all, in the exquisite contrast of finely graded amber with lilac subtly deepening from pale to all but black in *Hydrophis*

*nigrocincta*, there are harmonies and co-ordinations of natural colouring over which the eye lingers with a sense of pleasure in which the dread associated with their power and place in nature is for the moment lost. It is not the ophiology of India in general, which is exceptionally rich, but that of the poisonous varieties alone to which Dr. Fayrer has extended his study in this attractive work. Of about twenty families of *Ophidia*, with numerous genera and species known to naturalists, four only are venomous, some of them the most deadly of snakes. Of these the author has sought to illustrate all the principal forms, giving a description of each with an account of the poison apparatus, and its action upon man and the lower animals. Close observation of these various classes of reptiles during life and dissections after death have enabled him to verify the accuracy of the anatomical descriptions of Owen and Huxley, which he took as his guide in the inquiry, as well as the classifications and definitions for which he drew upon Günther, Jan, and other ophiologists of repute. Thus, without pretending to actual novelty in the zoological description of these snakes, he may claim to have brought together a mass of information which not only expands our scientific knowledge, but is of practical promise for the check of a serious drain upon the life of man and brute.

The two sub-orders comprised in the Indian *Thanatophidia*—a compound, by the way, which we can by no means pass by without a qualm—the Colubrine (*Elapide* and *Hydrophide*) and Viperine (*Crotalide* and *Viperide*), though there are subordinate marks of difference between them, are sufficiently distinguishable by the formation of the maxillary bone, which is longer and less mobile in the Colubrines, and by the character of the dentition, the Viperines having but one tooth, the long scimitar-like poison fang. Of the Colubrine class there are the *Najide*, or snakes with hoods or dilatable necks, and the *Elapide*, which have no hoods. Of the first of these two genera, the *Naja Tripudians*, or cobra bicolor (*Coluber naja*), is the sole representative species, though there are several varieties, each having a distinct name given to it by the natives. Such are the Gokurrah, with spectacles, or double marks on the hood, and the Keautiah, with but one circular mark or ocellus. The Gokurrah takes to the water reluctantly, the Keautiah freely, remaining for a considerable time under water. Dr. Fayrer's notes from native and Anglo-Indian sources furnish many minor distinctions based upon the colours, forms, and habits of the cobra. The Gokurrah, it is said, is essentially a snake of the town or city, the Keautiah of the fields and jungle; the latter, however, being often driven by the rainy season into the huts of the villagers, though it is but seldom found, like the Gokurrah, in the ruins or debris of old buildings. The Gokurrah is found all over Hindostan as far as the Oude Terai, and even the Nepal valley; whereas, say the snake-charmers, though this point is open to doubt, the Keautiah is, if not confined to Bengal, at least rare in the North-West and other parts of India. Of the abundance of these reptiles some idea may be gained from the fact of the number reported killed, under order of the Bengal Government, from May 29 to October 14, 1863, having been 18,423, and that from October 15 to December 7 having risen to 26,029, an average of 463½ a day, care having been taken to secure that none but poisonous snakes gave a title to the reward. Perhaps the largest and most formidable of venomous reptiles is the *Ophiophagus elaps*, the sole species of the genus *Ophiophagus*, known to the natives as *Sunkherchor*, "breaker of shells," or "Ai raj" in Orissa. It grows to the length of twelve or fourteen feet, being just rivalled, writes Dr. Fayrer, by *Lachesis mutus* of the genus *Crotalide*, found in British Guiana, mentioned by Waterton. It is hooded like the cobra, and in other respects not unlike it, but not so common; though, according to Günther, it is met with throughout nearly all India, the Andamans, and Philippines, Java, Sumatra, Borneo, and New Guinea, being most known in the damp climates of Assam, Bengal, Orissa, and Southern India.

Of the second class, *Elapide*, there are three Indian genera—namely, *Bungarus*, *Xenurelaps*, and *Callophis*. *Bungarus Cereuleus*, or Krait, is common to all India, and, next to the cobra, the most destructive of human life, though often mistaken for *Lycodon aulicus*, an innocent snake. The only other species known, *Bungarus fasciatus*, larger in size, attaining six feet in length, is mainly met with in Bengal, Southern India, and Burmah. It is also known in the North-West as "Koclea Krait." The *Xenurelaps*, of which but one species is at present known, and of which much has yet to be learnt, has been called *Elaps Bungaroides*, from its resemblance to *B. Cereuleus* or the Krait. The only specimen in England, from Chirra Punji in the Khasya hills, 15½ inches long, is in the Oxford Museum. The genus *Callophis* has at least six species in India, all venomous, though from the shortness of their fangs not often deadly to man or the larger animals. They are ground snakes, slow in movement, preferring hilly to level country, and feeding upon other reptiles—chiefly upon an innocent family, the Calamaria, which they much resemble in appearance—some varieties of these beautiful creatures being found high up on the Nilgherries, in Nepal, in Darjeeling, and in the Wynad, Malabar forests, three thousand feet above the sea. Some come from Upper Burmah and Singapore.

The *Viperide*, or vipers, and the *Crotalide*, or pit vipers, are the two families which make up the sub-order of *Ophidia viperiformes*. The former are represented by two species, of which one, the terrible *Daboia*, surpasses any of the *Crotalide* in death-dealing power. It attains a length of some fifty inches, frequents both hills and plains throughout Central and Southern India, and in

\* *The Thanatophidia of India; being a Description of the Venomous Snakes of the Indian Peninsula; with an Account of the Influence of their Poison on Life, and a Series of Experiments.* By J. Fayrer, M.D., C.S.I., F.R.S.E., &c. Folio. London: J. and A. Churchill. 1872.

Ceylon, where it is known as *Tic-polonga*, is said to climb trees. The *Echis*, of which only one species, *E. Carinata*, is known, called *Afie* in Delhi, has not been found in Bengal, though it is common in the North-West and Central Provinces, Punjab, Southern India, and Madras. The *Crotalide*, many of which are arboreal snakes, in colour resembling the trees in which they live, are less deadly than the other *Viperide*, or than their American congeners from whom they have obtained their name, owing to some vestige of the rattle being possessed by one of their four-fold genera, the *Halys*. Of *Trimeresurus*, the most numerous genus, eight species are distinguishable: of *Peltepor* and *Hypnale*, the remaining two, only one species apiece, *P. Macrolepis* and *H. Nepa*.

All these are terrestrial snakes. But not less venomous are the members of the family *Hydrophide*, peopling the salt water estuaries and tidal streams. Setting aside the fabulous stories of their vast size and power, Günther speaks of their attaining a length of twelve feet, though the largest seen by Dr. Fayer was under five feet. Of the seven genera known to naturalists, four only are enumerated by our author as represented in India. Among these *Platurus* seems to mark a transitional stage between the sea and land snakes, its general formation and ventral *scuta* indicating its power of moving and seeking its food on land as well as in the water. The *Hydrophide* in general have no well-marked ventral plates. Their nostrils, eyes, and head shields are peculiar. Another of these genera, *Pelamis*, having but one species, has the widest range of distribution, being common in the Bay of Bengal and in all the Eastern seas. The greater proportion, however, of sea-snakes found in these coasts is furnished by the genus *Hydrophis*, of which over thirty species are distinguished by Dr. Fayer, aided by the synopses of Drs. Anderson and Günther. Of fresh-water snakes no varieties of a poisonous kind are known.

Dr. Fayer's table of deaths from snake-bite in the Presidency of Bengal, including Orissa and Assam, in the Punjab and Oude, in the Central Provinces and in Burmah, during the year 1869, furnishes a statistical basis for estimating the destruction of life due to this extensive plague of India. The grand total of deaths among a population of 120,972,263 was no less than 11,416, or about four in every 10,000. Even these figures can hardly be accepted as representing the total mortality to be set down to the score of this terrible plague. Were the returns accurately and exhaustively made from all Hindostan, it is probable that upwards of 20,000 persons would be found to die annually in India from snake-bite alone. The local distribution of these victims, with their sex, age, &c., together with the proportion of deaths due to each kind of snake, will be found clearly set forth in Dr. Fayer's figures. No less than 2,690 fell to the fang of the cobra, 359 to the Krait, and 839 to other known snakes, in 6,922 cases the origin of the bite not having been traced. Upon the treatment of snake-bite the author, in the third section of his work, goes carefully into the pathology and modes of cure derived from native usage, as well as from the experience and observation of Europeans. In his opinion, confirmed as it is by careful experiment, in the case of a true bite, when a healthy and vigorous Cobra, Hamadryad, Bungarus, or Daboia, has imbedded its fangs and inoculated the poison, little chance, if any, of saving life exists, unless the most prompt and vigorous aid be given. Even then the resources of medical skill are but limited, and of uncertain efficacy. The bite may in many a case be inflicted without the venom being injected. Thus seems to be explained the supposed immunity of the mongoose. In Dr. Fayer's experiment the mongoose after an affray with a fresh and vicious cobra, though bleeding from many a wound, showed no signs of poisoning. The cobra was then made to close its jaws firmly upon the mongoose's thigh. In a few minutes the mongoose lay dead. The previous wounds had been mere scratches without injection of venom. Something may still be done by quick excision or ligature, or even by the use of stimulants and counteracting agencies. What our author holds to be the most practical remedy of all is the extirpation of these pests by a judicious and liberal system of rewards, on a scale adjusted to the comparative deadliness of each snake, assisted by the knowledge of their characters, which may be diffused by books like his. He would go as far as eight annas for a Cobra *Ophiophagus*, or *Daboia Russelli*, six for a *Bungarus caruleus*, four for a *Bungarus fasciatus* or *Echis*, and two for a *Trimeresurus*. A summary of suggestions for the treatment of persons bitten, intended in the first instance for the guidance of police officers, is appended, which should be hung up in every police-station or public place. There our author would also have in store a supply of whipcord for ligatures, irons for cauterizing, a knife for excision, with bottles of ammonia and nitric or carbolic acid. In the efficacy of these medicines when once the venom has passed into the blood Dr. Fayer has evidently not much more belief than he has in the snake-stone and other ridiculous kinds of amulet. Still there is no harm in trying them, or in applying the magnetic or electric current to the heart and diaphragm, or in the use of alcoholic or other stimulants. The injection of ammonia or liquor potassæ into the veins has not in his experiments been attended with the success which has been announced by other practitioners. We have indeed only to reflect, as he does, upon the depth to which the fang of either cobra or viper penetrates, the force with which the venom is injected, and the extreme rapidity with which it is hurried along the vascular system to the nerve centres, in order to feel how futile is likely to be any attempt to overtake and counteract the morbid virus. Experiments with strychnine and carbolic acid tend to encourage the

idea of there being some specific quality in these agents antagonistic to cobra poison, and they have been found so fatal to the snake itself as to recommend their free use as a means of keeping these venomous visitants out of harm's way, if not of extirpating them altogether. But reliance on so-called antidotes of whatever kind is judiciously deprecated, as tending to the loss of the few precious moments within which excision, the ligature, or the cautery may arrest the deadly agent at the threshold of the portals of life.

Dr. Fayer's report includes some interesting analyses of the chemical constituents and physiological functions of various snake poisons. These lead to but vague and indeterminate results as yet. But it cannot be beyond hope that further investigation may not only throw more satisfactory light upon the elementary nature of the virus itself, but may enrich our pharmacopœia by some means of applying this powerful class of animal secretions to the therapeutic treatment of disease. It has been observed, for instance, that the poison of the cobra kills, in the case of the lower animals at least, without destroying the coagulability of the blood, whilst that of the viper (*Daboia*) produces perfect and permanent fluidity. This distinction of effect has not however been fully verified in the case of man. Snake poison is essentially a neurotic, acting directly upon the source or centre of nerve force. It is also an irritant, causing instant inflammation when applied to the mucous membrane or conjunctiva; as well as a septic, as is shown by the sloughing of the wound and the septicæmia induced if the bitten creature survive. Still more marked is its spasmodic action upon the ventricles and auricles of the heart. We would hope that by further investigations in the direction thus opened, Dr. Fayer may crown, with valuable gains to practical pathology, the important contribution he has here made to the scientific knowledge of snake life.

#### MORE SCHOOL HISTORIES.\*

THE crop of small Histories of England seems altogether inextinguishable. We ever and anon find that a heap of them has gathered on our tables, and before one heap has gone by the path by which most of them have to go, another heap has commonly begun to be piled up. It is not unlikely that now and then a single grain in the heap may get overlooked, and may in the end come up for judgment along with the later batch of prisoners. One of the histories on our present list is as much as four years old, and we seem somehow to have heard its name before; but the book itself, as far as we can remember, is new to us, and we find it in company with a mass of others which we have certainly never dealt with before. Indeed, to arrange them in chronological order would be simply a hopeless attempt, for most of them bear no dates on their title-page; though, as some of them come down to the events of the last two or three years, they cannot have been very long before the world. Our present batch contains examples of very different degrees of merit. In several of them we are glad to see a real advance, which makes us hope that some day there may be such a thing as a sketch of English history written from a really scientific point of view, and withal written in clear and simple English. We suspect that this last requirement is the hardest of all; people have got so into the way of writing in the atrocious jargon which passes for fine writing, that it really needs an effort, and perhaps it no less needs a rather long literary experience, to enable any one to write his natural mother-tongue. We say that there is in some respects an improvement. It will hardly be supposed that we have read through every word of all the collection of books before us; but in each we have looked at some of the most dangerous places, and we find more than one which, judged by the standard of past gatherings, do not present any very monstrous blunders. It is plain that some of the results of scientific historical research are slowly and painfully making their way into the strata where people write histories for this and that "standard," for Government certificates of merit, and so forth. It is plain that some of the old blunders and superstitions are dying out, but this is shown almost wholly in details. Not one of the writers before us shows that grasp of the subject without which it is as impossible to write a small history as a great one. The treatment of the early period is everywhere unsatisfactory; not one seems to be able clearly to grasp and boldly to set forth that the English people is the English people. The old confused rubbish about Britons, Saxons, Heptarchy, and so forth, still comes in one shape or another, though in some it comes in much less offensive shapes than in others. Perhaps it is too much to expect this to be otherwise; to expect any of our writers to write the early history in a scientific, and therefore in a clear and easy, shape, is to expect them to go through the painful process of unlearning.

\* *History of the British Empire.* By William Francis Collier, LL.D. London: Nelson & Sons. 1868.

*A Catechism of English History.* Edited by Elizabeth M. Sewell. London: Longmans & Co. 1872.

*A New History of England, from the Earliest to the Latest Times.* By E. Berkley. London and Edinburgh: Laurie.

*Murby's Junior History of England: a Reading and Home Lesson Book for the Use of Schools.* London: Murby.

*John Heywood's Supplementary Manchester Readers: an Additional Series for Elementary Schools of all Grades.* The Historic Reader: compiled to suit the requirements of Standards V. and VI. of the New Code. Manchester: John Heywood. London: Simpkin & Marshall.

*The Young Tutor: a Complete Elementary Course in Six Parts.* By the Rev. Dr. Brewer. London: Cassell, Petter & Galpin.



Perhaps for what we want we shall have to wait for another generation, till a School History can be written by some one who has had only to learn, and has never had to unlearn.

Of the books before us one or two have a character of their own. The queerest planist of the "Manchester Historic Reader," which consists mainly of extracts put together in chronological order. It is curious to see what authors are chosen at Manchester for such a purpose. To "Caius Julius Caesar, the great Roman general," to Tacitus, Dion, and Breda, we can of course make no objection, and it may not be amiss some centuries later to give some bits from Fabian and Hall. But it is funny, when the youth of Manchester are to be taught "how the Saxons established themselves in England," to send them to "a History of England by the eminent statesman, orator, and essayist, Edmund Burke." It is wonderful how much Burke knew about it. We learn from him that "the army which came over under Hengist did not exceed fifteen hundred men." As this is five hundred to a keel, to say nothing of the accommodation needed for Rowena, this seems a very decent allowance. A great number of extracts come from Hume and the legend of William Wallace from the *Tales of a Grandfather*. In others we get bits from Thierry, Hallam, and once even from Palgrave. But as this last is the description of the battle of Senlac from his early work, the youth of Manchester, so far as they do not learn better at Owen's College, are taught that "Harold dropped from his steed in agony."

Another volume which may claim special notice is that by Dr. Brewer, whose author, who describes himself as of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, may, we think, on the whole claim the pre-eminence of having written the worst History of England which we have yet come across. Dr. Brewer is indeed much more than an historian of England; his writings are encyclopædic. *The Young Tutor*, alias "My First Book," is a treatise *de omni scibili*. English History comes in only in the middle, among a crowd of other things. "Reading and Spelling" and "Bible History" come before it; "Geography," "Common Things that I see around me," and "Science" come after it. The child who goes through the whole of Dr. Brewer's course begins in the first page with putting together A and B, but at the end he knows "what becomes of snails in winter time," and how "they manage to breathe in their close chamber." And even before that, he has learned "how many miles of land the river Thames drains," and "what is the use of phosphorus in food." We look however in vain for one or two pet bits of natural history of our own, as that a horse's hoof is solid and that a goat has hoofs of any kind—points on which we have found that all mankind are not so enlightened as they ought to be. We have also before now found ourselves called on to explain, for science' sake, that the shrew is not a mouse, and, for humanity's sake, that the harmless water-vole is not a rat. But Dr. Brewer's child is rather to be taught "how much drain-pipe he has in his body," which is coupled with the remark, which we have not the least thought of disputing in the abstract, that "the body should be well washed as often as the skin gets dirty." We must however part company with Dr. Brewer when he puts into the mouth of his young philosopher the further doctrine that "the body should be washed all over twice a week." At this rate we fear that Dr. Brewer is still a good way from godliness, and we should suspect that he who washes himself only twice a week does not go to church more than once.

We glance at Geography. When we come to the question, "What are the people of Austria called?" and get the answer, "The Austrians, their language is German," we admit the minute, the almost controversial, accuracy of this statement taken by itself; but standing by itself, without any reference to Hungary, Bohemia, and several other countries, it might possibly lead to misconceptions. As for "Bible History," we confess, old-fashioned as it may be, to a respect for the original so deep as to carry with it a hatred of all travesties. And, whatever may be said as to either children or congregations hearing or reading certain parts of the Old Testament which used to be read during the Sundays of Lent, we are sure that no good can come of this kind of thing:—

Joseph was a very good young man, but Pot-i-phar was told a wick-ed lie a-bout him, how that he was rude to his wife. And the cap-tain put him into pri-son.

But we turn to our immediate business, to that part of Dr. Brewer's pocket encyclopædia which has to do with the History of England. When we say that Dr. Brewer has written the worst History of England that we have yet come across, we do not mean to say that he has reached the highest pitch in point of mere ignorance and inaccuracy of detail. In these we must allow that he has been more than once outdone. But we certainly think that he stands unsurpassed for general absurdity and grotesque and misleading ways of putting things. The mere blunders are of course a good many, but it is not the mere blunders that are most striking. To begin at the beginning, it is certainly surprising to any one who has read Caesar's Commentaries to read such a version as the following:—

So the Romans said they would add it [Britain] to their own Empire; and, so saying, they sent an army under Julius Caesar to conquer it. The army crossed the sea in ships; fought with all the Britons who resisted them, got upon the island, and made themselves lords and masters of it.

Presently we read that, after the Romans were gone,

the first persons to annoy us were our neighbours in Scotland, then only rude and lawless robbers, but so daring that we were glad to obtain help from the Saxons.

We should certainly never have thought from Dr. Brewer's name that he was a Welshman. And so we have a great deal more about how "the Danes were very troublesome," how Domesday "is thought to be a very great curiosity indeed," how "the Black Prince was a fine young man," how Dr. Brewer "hopes that the cruel end [of Joan of Arc] is merely an idle tale," how Edward the Fifth and his brother "were sleeping together with their little arms around each other's necks, and their Prayer-books beside them, how Henry the Eighth "turned out a shocking bad man"; how "at one time [clearly at some time before the double election of Ursinus and Damasus] the Popes were modest, pious clergymen who did much good," and how an indulgence is "a little bit of paper," and how "any one who had done wrong might buy one of these scraps of papers, and it told him God would not punish him because he bought that piece of paper." We get also some odd things in still later times; for instance, an account of "Bonny Prince Charles" climbing into an oak, and Cromwell being made Lord Protector directly after Charles the First's "head was cut off with an axe." It is also funny to find "Free-trade" put down among the measures for which the reign of George the Fourth is remarkable, though it is plain that, if it were so, Dr. Brewer looks on Free-trade as something much less important than the use of omnibuses and the opening of the Zoological Gardens. We are also curious to know why, while all the other Kings and their reigns since the Conqueror are given in order, Henry the Third and Edward the Second are left out altogether. But we will end with Dr. Brewer's account of the relations between the two rival British Queens in the sixteenth century:—

When Elizabeth came to the throne there was a Queen of Scotland, whose name was Mary. Not Mary the sister of Elizabeth. She was dead. But another Mary, a cousin, very beautiful, but far less virtuous than fair. It has been said that she caused her husband to be murdered. I hope this is not true. But it is certain that she married the man who planned his murder.

The Scotch were angry at the whole affair, and took up arms against their beautiful Queen, who fled to England for refuge, and Elizabeth put her into a kind of prison.

It is my opinion that Elizabeth disliked her, not because she was naughty, but because she was beautiful. She thought that the gentlemen of her Court would admire her cousin the most; and Elizabeth was too fond of admiration to allow others to be admired more than herself.

We must explain to Dr. Brewer that children, as a rule, are not fools, though their teachers not uncommonly are.

None of the other books sink quite so low as this, though Murby's *Junior History*, "written solely," so an "Advertisement" tells us, "by Mr. W. Stewart Ross, a gentleman whose name is widely and creditably known in Educational Literature," is a formidable rival. The early parts and the reign of Edward the First are much as might be expected, and the reign of Henry the Eighth is told without any mention of the suppression of monasteries, but with a heaping together of abuse against which others besides Mr. Froude might protest on Sir Thomas More's principle. Such a study of human nature as the character of Henry the Eighth deserves something better than a daub either way. Dr. Collier's book is of a higher kind than this, though our soul is again grieved by talker-talker about Britons, Saxons, and Normans, and by the statement, disinterested at least in a gentleman from Trinity College, Dublin, that Alfred founded the University of Oxford. A passage near the beginning is a good specimen of the sort of muddle of truth and falsehood into which writers of this kind get by copying one thing from one book and another from another without any thought of the respective value of each:—

The origin of the names, Britain, Albion, Wales, and Scotland, is wrapped in much obscurity. Some have supposed that the name Britain was derived from Brutus, a son of Ascanius the Trojan. The name Albion—still used in the form Albyn, or Alpin, as the Highland term for Scotland—is supposed to have been given to the island by the Gauls, from the chalk cliffs of the south-eastern coast. It is a Celtic word, meaning "White Island," and is most likely connected with *albus* and *Alp*. Wales, or Weallias, is thought to have been so named from a Saxon word, meaning "wanderers" or "foreigners," because it was peopled by British refugees. It was also called Cambri. The Welsh have always called themselves Cymri, a name which probably connects them with the ancient Cimbri. Scotland took its name from a tribe called Scoti—perhaps akin to the Scythians of Northern Europe—who, early in the Christian era, passed from the north of Ireland into Britain, and, many centuries afterwards, gave their name to their new country.

The History by E. Berkley shows more power than that of Dr. Collier, but it is written throughout in a spirit of over-moralizing from a purely modern point of view, which must always stand in the way of any true understanding of history. The early part too shows, besides the usual ignorance and carelessness, a distinct feeling of contempt for the subject, which is of course fatal. Both these two writers get into hopeless confusions about the trial of Strafford. There would really seem to be some greater difficulty than we are able to see in what to us appears so plain a matter as that the Commons began with an impeachment, and, when they found that that was not likely to succeed, went on with a Bill of Attainder.

The most remarkable of the books before us is certainly that which comes second on our list, the *Catechism* edited by Miss Sewell. "Edited" is one of the vaguest of words, and it may mean either that Miss Sewell wrote the book herself, or that she simply allowed her name to be put in the title-page. We do not like the form of question or answer, but we are bound to say that this book, the smallest of the party, shows a very remarkable power of getting a great deal into a small compass, and, as things go, the actual mis-

takes are not particularly numerous or monstrous. We except, of course, the early history, over which the usual fatality hangs; it would seem that the day has not yet come when English children are boldly told that they are English children. But what is most to be remarked in this little book is the evident and deliberate care with which Miss Sewell, or the writer to whom Miss Sewell stands godmother, sets herself to work to spread abroad a considerable amount of very unwholesome matter under the harmless form of milk for babes. The doctrine of hereditary right is duly impressed on the youthful mind throughout. We quote two questions and answers, one from an early, another from a late time:—

Did Harold keep his oath?

No. The very same day that Edward the Confessor died, Harold himself being elected by the common voice of the people, was crowned in Westminster Abbey A.D. 1066. The Normans, to suit their purpose, said that Harold was crowned by Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, but he was really crowned by the Archbishop of York.

Had Harold any right to the English throne?

None whatever. His only claim rested on the fact that his mother was a daughter of Canute.

This "fact" about the daughter of Canute is a very odd one, and, to say nothing more, it would make the Danish conqueror a preternaturally youthful grandfather; but mark the assumption that no right whatever could come from an election by the common voice of the people, while some right possibly might come from a man's mother being the daughter of an earlier King. After some intermediate talk about the hereditary Edgar, Arthur, and Edmund Mortimer, we come to the following:—

Had William III. any right to the crown of England?

None by birth; his right rested on the choice of the majority of the English people, made after long discussion and careful consideration. They were unwilling entirely to set aside the principle of hereditary monarchy, so therefore elected William—first, as being the grandson of Charles I., and the husband of Mary, the daughter of James II.; and secondly, as being a Protestant, and having shown great wisdom in his management of the affairs of Holland.

It is something not only to know, but practically to remember, that William the Third was the grandson of Charles the First, but it would certainly seem from the more cautious language now used that the rights of the English people must have grown between 1066 and 1668. The really amusing thing about people who write in this way is that they almost always remember to forget that, on their showing, Edward the Confessor and Alfred himself were as much usurpers as Harold or John.

#### COBBETT'S MEMORIALS OF TWICKENHAM.\*

**MEMORIALS** of Twickenham! Can any title be more tempting? Sir Robert Peel, besides the faculty of statesmanship, was gifted with a fine instinctive taste for whatever was best in literature and art. A great living historian has been heard to say that he never conversed with any one so deeply read in the history of the French Revolution, and the few pages which he wrote to Lord Stanhope in vindication of Sir Robert Walpole are of more historical value than an equal number of volumes of his lordship's own composition. No one, therefore, could be better qualified to give an opinion as to books that were "wanted," and we know that Sir Robert Peel particularly urged a correspondent to attempt an "historical account of the villas in the neighbourhood of London." He especially referred to those which were mentioned in what he called "Horace Walpole's song about Strawberry Hill"; but he added, there were "a hundred others with very curious anecdotes of local and personal history connected with them," and he wound up by saying, "the county histories would furnish a substratum for the work, but everything would depend upon the liveliness and accuracy of the details." Such a work as is here sketched out, executed in a manner that would have satisfied the sketcher, would be one of the most delightful volumes that ever charmed mankind. But who is capable of writing it? Horace Walpole would perhaps have done it better than anybody that could be mentioned; and provided it had not robbed us of a single one of his matchless letters, we should have been well content to forego any amount of *Historic Doubts* and *Mysterious Mothers*. In the present day we have an ample supply both of accuracy and liveliness; but the accuracy seems for the most part confined to such light publications as the *Statesman's Year Book* and the *Post Office London Directory*, while the key-note of our liveliness is taken from the "Ice-cream Soda, a delicious drink," of one "writer for the million," or the feebler "Halfpenny Nectar" of another. But although we can think of no one able to do justice to the subject as a whole, there are doubtless many qualified to enter upon particular parts of it—an idea in which we have been confirmed by a reviewer of the present work, who says that he himself "would undertake to write a book about Twickenham Manor House alone that should be as large as Mr. Cobbett's, and should have a sparkling anecdote or a merry story in every page." This gallant offered us to count the pages in the volume, and, having ascertained the exact number, we now call upon our contemporary to redeem his pledge, and at once gladden our hearts by adding four hundred and twenty-six and a half sparkling anecdotes and merry stories to our literature. It is much to be lamented that out of so great a number not a single one seems to have fallen in the way of Mr. Cobbett, who is only

\* *Memorials of Twickenham, Paroecial and Topographical.* By the Rev. E. S. Cobbett, M.A., of Pembroke College, Oxford. Some time Curate of the Parish Church of St. Mary, Twickenham. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1872.

once betrayed into facetiousness, and that under the head of "Sunday Schools":—

Two curious answers, which show the unsatisfactory character of the education imparted by these schools, about twenty years ago, have been preserved. Upon the question being put, "What is a fox?" not a single child knew that it was an animal, while one girl who was anxious to give an answer said it was the place where they got beer. "The Fox" is the sign of a public house in the town.

Another girl, who had left the school and had gone to service, was asked if she could read; she replied, No, she could not read, but she could mark, interpreting the familiar words of the collect as having reference to marking linen.

This condition of things has happily been exchanged for a better.

Among the many eminent names connected with this parish, the three in which we take the greatest interest are those of Lord Bacon, Pope, and Horace Walpole. The connexion of the first with Twickenham is involved in obscurity and confusion, which Mr. Cobbett has not made the slightest attempt to clear up or remove. He does not seem to have the least suspicion that Bacon possessed two estates at this place, one of which he inherited, while the other was presented to him by the Earl of Essex, "with so kind and noble circumstances as the manner was as much as the matter." His "lodge" at Twickenham had been his country retreat for some years before this gift of Essex; indeed he was residing there when the gift was made. He himself tells us that after the Queen had "denied him the Solicitor's place," the Earl came over from "Richmond to Twickenham Park" to break the intelligence to him, and said among other things, "You fare ill because you have chosen me for your mean and dependence; you have spent your time and thoughts upon my matters; I die (these were his very words) if I do not somewhat towards your fortune; you shall not deny to accept a piece of land which I will bestow upon you." It follows, therefore, that if the land which Essex gave was situated at Twickenham, which nobody has ever disputed, it must have been a different piece from that which Bacon inherited. Mr. Cobbett has no scruple in devoting six pages to a list of the children of both sexes who, during the last hundred and fifty years, have been elected by the Vestry for Christ's Hospital; but he finds no space for this most interesting conversation, nor does he make any allusion to the letter in which Bacon apologizes for detaining a coach which he required for his journeys to and fro between Twickenham and Hampton Court, where the Queen then was. As Bacon was only thirty-four years old, the distance not more than three miles, and the age one in which Burghley would have made the journey on his mule, we have always thought this letter curiously characteristic of the stately and luxurious habits of the future Chancellor—the man who, "do what they could, scorned to go out in snuff"; and we never pass over what was once Pope's grotto, and under the renovated tower of Strawberry, without thinking of the lumbering vehicle of 1595, with its illustrious inmate, which so often passed along the same road.

With regard to Pope Mr. Cobbett is somewhat more communicative. He has discovered his mother's burial in the Registers, where Lysons and other investigators had failed to detect it. It stands thus:—"Mrs. Editha Pope, widow, June 11, 1733"; and eight years earlier there is "Massie Beach, November 7, 1725." He ought here to have quoted the terms in which Pope records their deaths in the little "Obituary" which he kept on the spare leaves of his *Elzevir Virgil*, now in the possession of Lord Mansfield:—"Nutrix mea fidelissima, M. Beech, obiit 5 Novem. 1725, æt. 77"; and "Mater mea charissima, pietissima et optima, Editha Pope, obiit septima die Junii, 1733, annum implens nonagesimum tertium." We have pleasure in dwelling on this truly loveable side of the poet's character, and in reading these simple records, meant for no eye but his own (the volume fetched five shillings at his sale); and in looking upon the monuments which he caused to be erected to his parents and his nurse, we forget all the dirty little stratagems and dodges which Mr. Dilke and Mr. Elwyn have taken such pains to ferret out. Mr. Cobbett tells us two things which we learn with great regret—namely, that the poet's grave was disturbed and his skull perhaps abstracted in 1859, when the interior of the church was curate-ized, and that the monument set up to his memory by Warburton was sadly defaced at the same period. We hate to hear of these indecent triflings with the dust of the mighty dead. The body of Robert Burns has been dug up twice at least, and on the last occasion the authorities of Dumfries boasted that they had replaced the skull "in a box lined with the softest materials." Laurence Sterne died in Bond Street, and was interred in what was then called the New Burying Ground on the Bayswater high road; but a few days afterwards his corpse was recognized on the table of a dissecting-room at Cambridge. Even the awful name of John Milton has not been enough to protect his grave from violation; and the last time we visited the shrine of Francis Bacon at St. Albans, we were concerned to find that, in order to "restore" the little church, it had been found necessary to build it all over again, and that the noble monument was removed from its site, and enclosed in a deal packing-case, with a hinged flap over the face, which opened at the sight of a sixpenny piece. *Scientiarum Lumen, Facundia Lex sic sedebat*, A.D. 1865. We care less about the mutilation of Pope's monument. It had little to recommend it as a work of art, and "Gulielmus Episcopus Gloucesteriensis" was characteristically made to catch the eye before the "Alexandro Pope," just as in the frontispiece to the prelate's edition of the poet's works the bust of Warburton was drawn larger than Pope's, and the engraver received particular instructions (in defiance of all conventional rules) to make the



"light" proceed from the former upwards to the latter. But if there is some doubt about the abstraction of Pope's skull, and not much sorrow to be wasted over the mutilation of the Warburtonian monument, there is no doubt, and very great sorrow, to be expressed about the utter destruction of his house and grotto and garden. The house was small and old and inconvenient; but the grotto was unique in its way, and every stone had its story; while the garden, which, as Horace Walpole says, was originally "a little bit of ground of five acres, inclosed with three lanes, and seeing nothing—Pope had twisted and twirled, and rhymed and harmonized this, till it appeared two or three sweet little lawns opening and opening beyond one another, and the whole surrounded with thick, impenetrable woods." At the poet's death this little paradise, of all his works the one on which he most prided himself, was purchased by Sir William Stanhope, who "was persuaded by Sir Thomas Robinson to improve it." "Refined taste went to work, the vocal groves were thinned, modish shrubs replaced them, and light and three lanes broke in; and if the Muses wanted to tie up their garters, there is not a nook to do it without being seen." This was bad enough, but what came afterwards was worse still:—

In 1807 it was again sold, and bought unfortunately by the Baroness Howe, the widow of the son of the celebrated Admiral. She married a second time, in 1812, Mr. Phipps (the Court oculist, who died blind!), who was subsequently created a baronet, and adopted the surname of Waller. Lady Howe's connection with Pope's residence is told in a moment. She razed the house to the ground, and blotted out utterly every memorial of the poet.

Forty years ago it was one of the sights of Twickenham to observe the pompous little oculist strutting into church, his bald head covered with powder, and his fingers glittering with rings outside his gloves. The vicar of those days was the (even then) old Mr. Proby, the same who entrusted Pope's skull to the intelligent keeping of the village plasterer; but although he was well entitled to say with Churchill,

Sleep at my bidding crept from pew to pew,

his "bidding" was always anticipated by Sir Wathen Waller. This was a weekly exhibition, but there was a still more comical annual one. On each first of June, the anniversary of Lord Howe's victory, his daughter gave a silver cup to be rowed for, and on these occasions the ex-oculist exhibited himself adorned with the insignia of the illustrious Admiral. Mr. Carlyle ought to add this circumstance to his memorable monograph on the sinking of the *Vengeur*. It is almost as ludicrous as the Carmagnole of Barère. The celebrated willow (so often confounded by Cockneys with the *villa*) perished. Mr. Cobbett tells us, in 1802, adding that "a few years before some tasteful verses which foretold its fate appeared in the *Microcosm of London*." But this can hardly be, as that beautifully illustrated work did not appear till 1811. The fact is that Mr. Cobbett is a great deal too much in the habit of quoting at second-hand. Had he referred to the *Microcosm of London* itself, he would have found it expressly stated that the verses were written in 1792; and in another instance, when copying Horace Walpole, if he had collated his quotation with the *Letters to Sir Horace Mann*, vol. iii., p. 439, he would not have made six blunders, or (as we are afraid he considers them) emendations, in seventeen lines.

The book is printed in fine, large, clear type, on thick and excellent paper, but we should have been glad to part with some of this luxury for a few inexpensive illustrations. We have the names of the Churchwardens paraded in sixteen columns, in a more conspicuous style than was ever yet vouchsafed to the Consuls of Republican Rome or to the Doges of Venice, but we have not so much as an outline map of the parish, past and present, such as any sixpenny guide-book would be ashamed to be without. Possibly Mr. Cobbett has heard that to the absence of scenery in our ancient theatres we are indebted for the finest descriptive passages in Shakespeare and others of our old dramatists, and has therefore trusted to his pen rather than his pencil; but for our own part we must confess we should have derived a better notion of Pope's house from the simplest woodcut than by following his invitation "to look at any engraving of Sir W. Stanhope's or Lord Mendip's villa at Twickenham, and remove with the mind's eye the wings on each side." Mr. Cobbett concludes his preface by thanking two of his "personal friends, who assisted him in the correction of the proofs as they passed through the press." Three pairs of critical eyes therefore failed to see anything startling in the fact (p. 317) of Walpole's possessing an oil-painting of the Marriage of Edward VI. of Ben Jonson visiting Clarendon after the Restoration, or of Madame du Deffand's dying in 1740. The familiar name, too, of Lady Mary is habitually misspelt, as are at least a score of others of lesser note. Nevertheless we must thank Mr. Cobbett for giving us a book which, if not so good as it ought to be, is at least one step in advance of its predecessor.

#### CARDINAL DE RETZ.\*

(Second Notice.)

THE first part of De Retz's Memoirs reaches to the close of 1643, when, at the age of thirty, he had attained the immediate object of his ambition in the Coadjutor-archbishopric of Paris. He was born, as we said before, in September 1613, and he had a Saint

for his tutor—one of those whose sanctity rests on better evidence than bulls of canonization—in the person of Vincent de Paul, and was afterwards sent, at twelve years old, to the Jesuit College of Clermont. Both his parents had taken the strange step of retiring into religious communities. The boy did not, however, profit much by their pious example, or by the instructions of his masters. At fifteen he fought his first duel, and at nineteen he attempted to carry off and seduce his cousin, who was a year younger. From his birth, however, he had been destined for the ecclesiastical career, the archbishopric of Paris being a kind of heirloom in the family, and was wearing the ecclesiastical dress. Neither his duels nor his gallantries, as he himself tells us, could restrain his father from using every effort "to attach to the Church perhaps the most unecclesiastical soul in the universe." And he really does seem at first to have been desirous of escaping a position for which he knew himself to be conspicuously unfit. But, as Tallemant justly says, though he was inclined to gallantry, his ruling passion was ambition, and he soon found the means of reconciling his interests and his tastes. The moral standard of the age was sufficiently lax both in the Church and in the world, and De Retz's uncle, who held the see of Paris, was anything but a spotless character; he seems indeed to have got into trouble, not so much on account of his irregularities as because the objects of his criminal attachment were of low birth. His own manner of life can have been no secret at the time, and is matter not of apology, but of boasting in his Memoirs, written in mature age; but he always preserved appearances as far as his interests required. At twenty-two we find him diversifying his amours and duels by "preaching the Ascension, the Pentecost, and the Fête-Dieu at the Carmelite Church." He was then in minor orders and had already been a canon of Notre-Dame for seven years; four years before he had published his exercises for the bachelor's degree, dedicated to his uncle the Archbishop of Paris. Yet he says of himself three years after this, in 1638, "Je n'eusse aucun dessein d'être d'Eglise"—a statement which we take the liberty entirely to disbelieve. In the same year he visited Venice and Rome, and his own report of his conduct there proves clearly enough that he was resolved not to let any indiscretions stand in the way of his ambition:—

J'exécutai fort bien ma résolution. Je ne laissai pas la moindre ombre de débauche ou de galanterie: je fus modeste au dernier point dans mes habits; et cette modestie, qui paroissoit dans ma personne, étoit relevée par une très-grande dépense, par de belles livrées, par un équipage fort leste, et par une suite de sept ou huit gentilshommes, dont il y en avoit quatre chevaliers de Malte. Je disputai dans les Ecoles de Sapience, qui ne sont pas à beaucoup près si savantes que celles de Sorbonne; et la fortune contribua encore à me relever.

In the same way he sustained in Paris "toutes les apparences d'un bon ecclésiastique." But it must not be supposed that this involved any intermission of his love intrigues, one of his mistresses being Madame de Guéméné, who was constantly oscillating between the pleasures of the world and the pious retreat of Port Royal. It was not till 1642, when the coveted archbishopric seemed almost in his grasp, that he resolved, according to his own statement, "non pas seulement à suivre, mais encore à faire ma profession," and from that time he became "more regular, at least in appearance." He studied a good deal, and cultivated the society of learned and pious men. He even affected a great esteem for the *dévotés*, though he did not profess to be one of them, "not being sure how far he could keep up the character." He had before aspired to reputation as a preacher, and he now gained much *éclat* by a dispute with the Protestant minister Mestrezat, which led to the conversion of the Abbé Tallemant. Not only were the clergy loud in his praise, but even St. Vincent de Paul, his old tutor, pronounced him "not far from the kingdom of God." All this time, however, he was carrying on an intrigue with a married woman, Madame de Pommereux; but it was managed quietly:—"Je ne me pouvois passer de galanterie; mais... les apparentes affaires des autres couvroient la mienne, qui étoit, ou du moins qui fut quelques temps après plus effective." As D'Argenson remarks, "he wished for the glory of converting others before converting himself." It is a curious illustration of the sort of feeling on such matters at the time that the Protestant Mestrezat good-naturedly avoided pressing him in controversy on the points at issue between the Gallican and Ultramontane schools, on the express ground that "it would not be fair to prevent the Abbé de Retz from becoming a Cardinal," by embroiling him with Rome. De Retz thus describes his position and prospects in 1642:—

Vous voyez, par ce que je viens de vous dire, que mes occupations ecclésiastiques étoient diversifiées et égayées par d'autres, qui étoient un peu plus agréables; mais elles n'en étoient pas assurément déparées. La bienséance y étoit observée en tout, et le peu qui y manquoit étoit suppléé par mon bonheur, qui fut tel que tous les ecclésiastiques du diocèse me souhaitoient pour successeur de mon oncle, avec une passion qu'ils ne pouvoient cacher. M. le cardinal de Richelieu étoit bien éloigné de cette pensée: ma maison lui étoit fort odieuse et ma personne ne lui plaisoit pas, par les raisons que je vous ai touchées ci-dessus.

In the December of that year the main obstacle to his promotion was removed by the death of Richelieu, and the King, Louis XIII., died the following May. The Queen-Mother was favourably disposed towards him, and not the less so from his having been an enemy of Richelieu's. Whether there is any truth in a story he tells to account for her favourable opinion, showing that he could at least respect virtue in others and do an act of kindness to a girl whom he had failed to seduce, is very doubtful. The story, one of the very few tending to his credit, is suspiciously like

\* *Œuvres du cardinal de Retz*. Nouvelle édition. Par M. Alphonse Feillet. Tome I. II. Paris: Hachette & Co. 1872.

an anecdote in the life of Bayard, which was then in the full swing of popularity. The King, shortly before his death, had offered him the bishopric of Agde, but "his devotion by no means carried him to Languedoc," and he declined it. Within a few months he was named by the Queen for the Coadjutor-archbishopric of Paris; and then, and not till then, he finally committed himself to his profession by taking sacred orders. To use his own not very ecclesiastical figure of speech, he had considered himself hitherto only in the parterre or the orchestra, playing on the violin, but now he mounted the stage. He received the bulls for his consecration on All Saints eve, and next day commenced preaching the Advent of St. John in the Place de Grève, before a large concourse, as it was not common in Paris to see an Archbishop in the pulpit. And so ends the first act of his life drama. The second part of the Memoirs, or rather so much of it as is comprised in these volumes, carries us to the end of 1649, including the period of the first Fronde.

The principles on which the new Archbishop determined to act, and to which he consistently adhered, may be best explained in his own words, which reveal his true character with a frankness that leaves nothing to be desired:—

Comme j'étois obligé de prendre les ordres, je fis une retraite à Saint-Lazare, où je donnai à l'extérieur toutes les apparences ordinaires. L'occupation de mon intérieur fut une grande et profonde réflexion sur la manière que je devois prendre pour ma conduite. Elle étoit très-difficile. Je trouvois l'archevêché de Paris dégradé, à l'égard du monde, par les bassesses de mon oncle, et à l'égard de Dieu, par sa négligence et par son incapacité. Je prévoyois des oppositions infinies à son rétablissement; et je n'étois pas si aveuglé, que je ne connusse que la plus grande et la plus insurmontable étoit dans moi-même. Je n'ignorois pas de quelle nécessité était la règle des mœurs à un évêque. Je sentois que le désordre scandaleux de ceux de mon oncle me l'imposoit encore plus étroite et plus indispensable qu'aux autres; et je sentois, en même temps, que je n'en étois pas capable, et que tous les obstacles et de conscience et de gloire que j'opposerois au dégrèvement ne seroient que des digues fort mal assurées. Je pris, après six jours de réflexion, le parti de faire le mal par-dessus, ce qui est sans comparaison le plus criminel devant Dieu, mais ce qui est sans doute le plus sage devant le monde: et parce qu'en le faisant ainsi l'on y met toujours des prétextes, qui en couvrent une partie; et parce que l'on évite, par ce moyen, le plus dangereux ridicule qui se puisse rencontrer dans notre profession, qui est celui de mêler à contre-pensée le péché dans la dévotion.

Voilà la sainte disposition avec laquelle je sortis de Saint-Lazare. Elle ne fut pourtant pas de tout point mauvaise; car je pris une ferme résolution de remplir exactement tous les devoirs de ma profession, et d'être aussi homme de bien pour le salut des autres, que je pourrois être méchant pour moi-même.

He was affable to all, paid his court every week to the Queen and Cardinal Mazarin, and displayed much apparent zeal in the administration of his diocese, making capital out of the jealousy of the actual Archbishop by pleading his good intentions when he was unable to act. He instituted a rigid examination into the capabilities of the priests of the diocese, and fixed their position accordingly; in 1645 he took part in the General Assembly of the Gallican clergy. But his real interest was not in these matters. It would be difficult to find a more felicitous sketch than is contained in his Memoirs of the first four years of the Regency, while all went merry as a marriage bell. The Government was strong through the union of the Royal family, the temporary popularity of the new Minister, Cardinal Mazarin, and the glory shed on the French arms by the victory of Rocroi. And De Retz does more than merely paint a surface picture. He had a keen political insight, though he regarded politics much as a game at chess, and a still keener discernment of character, only that his personal antipathies and jealousies are apt to discolour his judgment, as is notably illustrated in his manner of handling Richelieu, whom he detested, and whose government he calls "the most scandalous and dangerous tyranny that ever enslaved a State." He is facile princeps among the Memoir writers of his day, and a more vivid, if not more accurate, impression will be gained from his pages both of this period of happy tranquillity and of the wars of the Fronde which followed, than from the graver historians who have undertaken to chronicle them in detail.

The main incidents of the first Fronde are the presentation of the Twenty-seven Articles to the Court on June 3, 1648, the Treaty of St. Germain's in the following October, and the Treaty of Rueil, which closed the war, if such it can be termed, in March 1649. It was just the sort of kid-gloved revolution to suit a temperament like De Retz's. Seldom in history has such a state of agitation and anarchy been witnessed with so little real principle at issue, and so little of genuine political conviction or earnestness on either side. Men were struggling for advancement or wealth; women—who played a prominent part in the affair—for their paramours; official bodies, like the Parliament of Paris, for their corporate privileges and interests. De Retz seems to have been chiefly actuated by his passion for notoriety, and his rivalry with Mazarin. The pamphlet literature of the Fronde fills hundreds of volumes, and exhibits a superabundance of violent passion, but exceedingly little of intelligent and serious conviction. How little notion of constitutional principle there was, among the revolutionary leaders may be gathered from De Retz's own representations. He complains of the absence, not of liberty, but of law, and this want he proposed to supply through the independent action of the sovereign, whom he viewed as the only fountain of law, but who, like the Deity, was bound to acquiesce for ever in what he had once ordained. His patriotism, as well as that of other leaders of the Fronde, is rendered very suspicious by their indirect complicity at least with the intrigues with Spain against their own Government. And the

ease with which De Retz suffered himself to be drawn off from active participation in the "War of Princes," as the second Fronde is sometimes called, by the offer of a Cardinal's hat, sufficiently betrays the motive power of his erratic course. That he did not, like many of his colleagues, seek to make pecuniary capital out of the turmoil may be admitted, and so far he contrasts favourably with Mazarin, who amassed an enormous fortune. The very name of the Fronde, if we may accept the usual derivation from a favourite game of the Paris gamins, who used to sling at each other (*fronder*) on the fortifications, is indicative of the moral character of the struggle; and its second name, the War of Princes, shows how little it could be considered a popular movement at bottom. De Retz, though he obtained his hat, had eventually to pay for his democratic popularity—and for awhile he was the soul of all the *conciliabula* both in Parliament and in the *halles*—by fifteen months' imprisonment at Vincennes, and the resignation of his coadjutorship. But that lies beyond the present portion of his Memoirs. The following passage, from his graphic account of the day of the barricades, August 26, 1648, in which he assigns to himself a much more prominent rôle than is borne out by any contemporary evidence, is a fair specimen of his descriptive style. The Tacitean comment at the close is eminently characteristic, and may be compared with his sketch of the requisite qualities for a good party leader, which he regards as quite equal to those required for making a good emperor, resolution being as important as "heroic judgment," of which the principal use is to distinguish the extraordinary from the impossible. With less of frivolity, and greater powers of self-control, De Retz might have come very near fulfilling his own ideal. But a man whom it was impossible to respect, even putting aside the incongruity of his profession, could never hope, with all his brilliant accomplishments, to exert more than a precarious and temporary influence. But it is time for our extract, with which the notice of these interesting and carefully edited volumes must conclude:—

Le lendemain de la fête, c'est-à-dire le 26 d'août de 1648, le Roi alla au Te Deum. L'on borda, selon la coutume, depuis le Palais-Royal jusques à Notre-Dame, toutes les rues de soldats du régiment des gardes. Aussitôt que le Roi fut revenu au Palais-Royal, l'on forma de tous ces soldats trois bataillons, qui demeurèrent sur le Pont-Neuf et dans la place Dauphine. Comminges, lieutenant des gardes de la Reine, enleva dans un carrosse fermé le bonhomme Broussel, conseiller de la grande chambre, et il le mena à Saint-Germain. Blancmenil, président aux enquêtes, fut pris en même temps aussi chez lui, et il fut conduit au bois de Vincennes. Vous vous étonnerez du choix de ce dernier; et si vous aviez connu le bonhomme Broussel, vous ne seriez pas moins surpris du sien. Je vous expliquerai ce détail en temps et lieu; mais je ne vous puis exprimer la consternation qui parut dans Paris le premier quart d'heure de l'enlèvement de Broussel, et le mouvement qui s'y fit dès le second. La tristesse, ou plutôt l'abattement, saisit jusques aux enfants; l'on se regardoit et l'on ne se disoit rien.

L'on éclata tout d'un coup: l'on s'émut, l'on courut, l'on cria, l'on ferma les boutiques. J'en fus averti, et quoique je ne fusse pas insensible à la manière dont j'avois été joué la veille au Palais-Royal, où l'on m'avoit même prié de faire savoir à ceux qui étoient de mes amis dans le Parlement que la bataille de Lens n'y avoit causé que des mouvements de modération et de douceur, quoique, dis-je, je fusse très-piqué, je ne laissai pas de prendre le parti, sans balancer, d'aller trouver la Reine et de m'attacher à mon devoir préférentiellement à toutes choses. Je le dis en ces propres termes à Chapelain, à Gomberville et à Plot, chanoine de Notre-Dame et présentement chaireux, qui avoient dîné chez moi. Je sortis en rochet et camail, et je ne fus pas au Marché-Neuf que je fus acablé d'une foule de peuple, qui harloît plutôt qu'il ne crioit. Je m'en démenai en leur disant que la Reine leur feroit justice. Je trouvais sur le Pont-Neuf le maréchal de la Meillerie à la tête des gardes, qui, bien qu'il n'étoit encore en tête que quelques enfants qui disoient des injures et qui jetoient des pierres aux soldats, ne laissoit pas d'être fort embarrassé, parce qu'il voyoit que les nuages commencent à se grossir de tous côtés. Il fut très-aise de me voir, il m'exhorta à dire à la Reine la vérité. Il s'offrit d'en venir lui-même rendre témoignage. J'en fus très-aise à mon tour, et nous allâmes ensemble au Palais-Royal, suivis d'un nombre infini de peuple, qui crioit: "Broussel! Broussel!"

Nous trouvâmes la Reine dans le grand cabinet, accompagnée de M. le duc d'Orléans, du cardinal Mazarin, de M. de Longueville, du maréchal de Villeroi, de l'abbé de la Rivière, de Baurin, de Guittaut, capitaine de ses gardes, et de Nogent. Elle ne me reçut ni bien ni mal. Elle étoit trop fière et trop aigre pour avoir de la honte de ce qu'elle m'avoit dit la veille; et le cardinal n'étoit pas assez honnête homme pour en avoir de la bonne. Il me parut toutefois un peu embarrassé, et il me fit une espèce de galimatias par lequel, sans me l'oser toutefois dire, il eût été bien aise que j'enasse conque qu'il y avoit eu des raisons toutes nouvelles qui avoient obligé la Reine à se porter à la résolution que l'on avoit prise. Je feignis que je prenois pour bon tout ce qu'il lui plut de me dire, et je lui répondis simplement que j'étois venu là pour me rendre à mon devoir, pour recevoir les commandements de la Reine, et pour contribuer de tout ce qui seroit en mon pouvoir au repos et à la tranquillité. La Reine me fit un petit signe de la tête, comme pour me remercier; mais je sus depuis qu'elle avoit remarqué, et remarqué en mal, cette dernière parole, qui étoit pourtant très-innocente et même fort dans l'ordre, en la bouche d'un coadjuteur de Paris. Mais il est vrai de dire qu'après des princes il est aussi dangereux et presque aussi criminel de pouvoir le bien que de vouloir le mal.

#### LAMON'S LIFE OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN.\*

IT is not easy to understand with what purpose Mr. Lamon's *Life of Abraham Lincoln* has been written. It is far too large for a party treatise, even if it were otherwise likely to subserve the purposes of political faction, or if it were likely that any political interests could be affected by a memoir of a man long dead, and whose history is connected exclusively with questions wholly gone by. It has nothing of the sharpness and point of a political work intended for popular effect, and it is impossible to suppose that a large octavo volume of 500 pages, terminating with

\* *The Life of Abraham Lincoln, from his Birth to his Inauguration as President.* By Ward H. Lamon. With illustrations. Boston: Osgood & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1872.



the commencement of Mr. Lincoln's Presidency, can have a numerous body of readers among the busy citizens of the States, and in the midst of an eager party contest. Yet, party purposes apart, it is even more difficult to conceive why the book should have been written. It can hardly prove a very profitable speculation; for little interest attaches to the early life of a man who was only distinguished during its few closing years, and, however curious people might once have been as to the personal antecedents of one who, though rather by accident than by eminence, filled so great a place at so critical a period, the day has surely gone by when that curiosity would carry them patiently through this ponderous volume. It cannot be considered as a valuable contribution to political history; for Mr. Lincoln's part in politics was a secondary part up to 1860, and even in his own State his prominence was of very recent date, and due rather to his relations with Mr. Douglas than to his own powers or character. It is not inspired by the admiration of a follower, the sympathy of a friend, or the professional enthusiasm of the biographer; for, though the writer repeats in every other page the conventional eulogies of Mr. Lincoln which were rigorously exacted from every one who, for a couple of years after his death, mentioned the name of the "martyred President," there is nothing real or hearty about his praise; he never speaks of Lincoln in the tone even of sincere respect, and his record is likely to damage, and certainly not to exalt, the reputation of its subject. We should have suspected that the work was prompted by party and personal animosity to Mr. Lincoln if it were usual with American writers to conceal such animosity under a mask of approval or of impartiality, and to trust to an unfriendly relation of facts to do away with the effect of formal commendations, and produce upon the reader's mind an impression unfavourable to the character and conduct of the person so maliciously praised. At any rate, it is fair to warn readers that, if Mr. Lamon's tone is not openly hostile, the drift of his narrative is so; and that his portrait of the late President must be taken as an unfavourable, if not an unfriendly, one. Not the most inveterate Secessionist—not Mr. E. Pollard himself—could write with more damaging effect of the victorious enemy of the South than this Unionist, Northern, and apparently Republican biographer.

That Mr. Lincoln was not a man of culture or learning, that whatever education he had was self-acquired, that even in domestic politics he had to trust rather to native common sense and party commonplaces than to thorough knowledge, and that of political science and the higher philosophy of legislation and government, as of the history and relations of foreign States, he was wholly ignorant, is generally known and acknowledged. That he was a self-made man "what there was of him" was his familiar boast; nor was he at all abashed by the knowledge that many—perhaps a majority—of his countrymen agreed with the old Democrat who retorted upon him "that it was a damned bad job." But it will surprise most Englishmen to be told that his family were among the least respectable of the poor and vagrant class to which they belonged; that his father was a thriftless, unsettled "ne'er do well"; that he himself, though always amiable, popular, and personally honest, bore in boyhood and early youth no high character for steadiness or diligence; that he was much more famous as a wrestler than as a railsplitter, and seems to have been little better than a loafer till he became an active and influential politician. Yet such is unquestionably the impression made by Mr. Lamon's account; and that account is carefully justified by the recorded testimony of those who knew him best, who were among his earliest and closest associates, and whose character affords some *prima facie* evidence as to his own. Abraham Lincoln could work; but he was apt to idle himself, and provoke others to idle, while he amused them with stories and jests. He was an indefatigable student, and grudged no pains to get hold of a book that he wanted, and no labour to master it. He was sober, though he thought it necessary to drink, and treat others to drink in public, for popularity's sake, while personally disliking spirits and avoiding them in private. He was courageous, kindly, and pacific, a peacemaker among rowdies and an arbitrator among athletes and pugilists. But of that steady regular industry by which most men of his class have risen from the ranks, he seems, at least in youth, to have been incapable. His reading had made him—as he remained to the end of his life—a Deist; his American education had taught him a servile worship of public opinion, such as the most abject of courtiers would be ashamed of offering to the most despotic of autocrats. In short, his was a nature essentially strong, simple, and amiable, placed under the most unfavourable circumstances, and emerging from them blameless in most of the relations of private life, but neither a high-minded citizen nor a clean-handed politician. Those who read Mr. Lamon's biography will find no difficulty in believing the breach of faith in regard to Fort Sumter charged upon the President and his advisers by those who conducted the negotiation on behalf of the South, and believed by the most impartial authorities. Of such a trick in private life he would have been as incapable as of personally taking a bribe; that he was not scrupulous in politics the story of his connexion with the worst jobs of the Whig party in Illinois sufficiently proves. American politics are everywhere infected by immorality and dishonesty, but their worst features are always to be seen in a new and half-settled State, such as was Illinois when the Lincoln family removed thither from Kentucky, and long after; and Abraham Lincoln was not the man to stand firm against the corrupt schemes and selfish claims of his constituents as the champion of a morality higher than that in vogue

around him. Indeed, we doubt whether he would not have considered such pretensions as an arrogant contempt of that "will of the people" in which he, with so many other Americans, recognized a species of divine right.

His first step into notoriety was made at the commencement of the Indian struggle known as the Black Hawk War, when, owing probably to his reputation for physical prowess, he was chosen captain of a volunteer company. His principal exploit in that capacity was the rescue of a friendly Indian from the suspicious fury of his own men; which he achieved, not by any exertion of authority, but by challenging the company at large, offering his antagonist the choice of weapons. A little after this he first appeared as a stump orator, and thenceforward devoted himself to politics, studying law at the same time as a means of earning a livelihood. As a pleader he seems to have been very moderately successful—able to live, but little more. His biographer affirms that he was too scrupulous to defend a man whom he firmly believed to be guilty. But he relates a story which, if true, exhibits Mr. Lincoln as less scrupulous than an average Old Bailey lawyer. The son of an old friend had committed an atrocious murder, and his mother, in great distress, applied to Lincoln to defend him. The case was very clear, the assassin's features having been recognized by moonlight. Lincoln put into the hands of the officer of the Court an almanac of the *previous year*; then, in his defence, called for it, as for an almanac of the year itself, and from it proved to the jury that there was no moon on the night in question. His client was acquitted. It is to be hoped that the story is as unfounded as it is apparently incredible.

Mr. Lincoln served a term in the State Legislature, where, as one of the representatives of the Springfield district, he was concerned in some scandalous jobs for its benefit, of which the chief object was the transfer of the State capital from Vandalia to Springfield. At a later period he was elected to Congress. At this time he was a moderate Whig; hostile to the extension of slave territory, but at the same time decidedly opposed to the conduct and policy of the Abolitionists. Nor was he ever an Abolitionist in the proper sense of the term; he denied the right of the Federal Government to interfere with slavery in the States by whose laws it was established, and even in issuing the Emancipation Proclamation he avowedly acted, not for the benefit of the negroes, but for the injury of the Southern people. During the earlier part of his public career he avoided as much as possible the dangerous topic. But the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, leading to the Kansas imbroglio, roused him into resolute antagonism to the Southern policy, the more so that Stephen A. Douglas, his neighbour and successful rival, was the leader of the Squatter-Sovereignty party, which affirmed that the right of admitting or excluding slavery from the Territories rested with the first settlers thereof, and not with Congress. This was the middle course between the judgment of the Supreme Court—which affirmed that every citizen of the Union had a right to carry his property where he pleased within the Territories under Federal authority, and that Congress had no more right to exclude or confiscate the Southerner's slaves than the Northerner's cattle—and the contention of the Republicans that it was the right and duty of Congress to exclude slavery. Whichever extreme party might be right, there can be little doubt that Douglas's *via media* was absurd. It could not be the right of a few hundred pioneers to settle the destiny of a country as large as France. The Constitution expressly gave to Congress the right of legislating for the Territories; and if the right of excluding slaves existed at all, it would seem to be clearly covered by that general power. Mr. Lincoln saw his advantage. He had long been envious of Douglas. Within the State they were recognized rivals and opponents; outside, Douglas was one of the foremost men in the Union, and Lincoln was nobody. But Douglas's mistake, and the Kansas war which followed, delivered him into Lincoln's hands. Two Presidential contests were fought on this issue. In the first Buchanan triumphed by the aid of the whole Southern and a minority of the Northern vote. But during his rule the Southern faction in Kansas, finding themselves in a minority, were driven into measures clearly lawless. Douglas's position grew worse and worse; Lincoln, encountering him on one occasion after another, pressed him harder and harder, till at last Douglas was compelled to repudiate the Lecompton Convention (that elected by the Missourian intruders into Kansas), and thereby broke up the democratic party into Northern and Southern sections. Meanwhile, Mr. Lincoln, as the personal antagonist of the great democratic leader, fixed upon himself more and more the eyes of the country. Had not Douglas been a citizen of Illinois, Lincoln would have been little heard of. But as the champion of Republicanism in his own State, taking every opportunity to challenge and attack the Democratic leader, he became necessarily a prominent figure; and his rough, effective logic, his position as a self-made man, and the anxiety of the party to put forward a candidate who might rival Douglas's popularity in the West, pointed him out as an available candidate. The theatrical trick of one of his earliest friends, who brought into the hall of the Chicago Convention certain rails which, as he alleged, Lincoln and he had made together, appealed forcibly to the democratic prejudice of Americans in favour of a "plain" working-man. From the first Lincoln's name stood next to Seward's in the ballot; after two or three trials it was evident that Seward could not command a clear majority, and Lincoln was selected. The party were in a hopeless minority; but, on the other hand, their opponents were fatally divided. By his repudiation of the Lecompton Convention, Douglas

had alienated the South, while the Northern Democrats adhered firmly to him. The result is familiar to our readers. Three Democratic candidates divided the majority, and Lincoln was returned by about 1,800,000 votes against 2,800,000. Scarcely a single vote was given for him south of the Potomac. The long predicted crisis had come. For the first time a President had been elected by a single section exclusively on a distinctly sectional issue; the North alone had chosen the candidate of a party whose platform was hostility to the South, and whose more violent members had scarcely ceased to celebrate the funeral obsequies of the baffled instigator of a slave insurrection. The Southern States accepted the election as a declaration of political war, and withdrew from the Union.

We need not follow Mr. Lamont either into the story of Mr. Lincoln's inauguration, or into the discussion of his character. The former has ceased to be of general interest; the latter is powerless to affect the impression already made by the narrative itself. This certainly shows Mr. Lincoln in a very different light from that in which, since his death, enthusiastic partisans have painted him; but the lights and shadows of the new portrait give it a probability which is wanting to the previous one. It would have been little less than a miracle if the Illinois railsplitter had really emerged from a pioneer village and a political career in the West as the saint and hero he was represented; it is natural enough that he should become by such a training what Mr. Lamont describes him. If not a great character, he was on the whole a good one; if no purist, he was a kindly, well-meaning, simple-hearted man. We have forbore to mention his love affairs and his marriage, of which Mr. Lamont has much to say that, according to English notions, would be best left unsaid, and that must give exquisite pain to his living family and friends. Those who are curious in such matters may read the book itself; but unless they are more deeply interested in Mr. Lincoln's history than we can pretend to be, they will be weary indeed ere, by fair and honest reading, they reach the 537th page, and, with Mr. Buchanan, take leave of the hero on his installation in the White House.

#### HEALTH AND COMFORT IN HOUSE-BUILDING.\*

IN this treatise two doctors offer some views on the subject of ventilation which appear to deserve attention. They approach their readers full of a conviction founded on sensible theory, and established by the best kind of experience, for each has built, and lived in, a house erected after his own principles. Whatever may be thought of their claim to have struck out a new line in regard to warming and ventilating houses, their practical experience and professional knowledge of the air we breathe and the air we ought not to breathe entitle them to a respectful hearing.

"The art of warming or ventilating a building," say the authors at the outset, "is not a difficult one, but that of warming and ventilating is extremely difficult, and cannot be said to have attained to anything like perfection." The common notion of unscientific persons is that all that is wanted to secure fresh air is a large aperture from without, thus ignoring the fact that "inner air must go out for outer air to come in," and that the incoming air is almost always cold air. But houses to be healthy require to be planned and built with an eye to the winter months, and to the keeping out of cold air, to which end the writers contend that there should be no direct admission of external air into the rooms of a house for at least eight months of the year. "Warm air moderately impure," writes Dr. Inman, quoted in these pages, "is less noxious to invalids and those whose health is shaky than cold air and absolute purity; the purity does not counterbalance the effect of the chill." But ventilating processes introduce cold air, unless the warming process is concurrently taken into account; and hence the thousand devices of the ignorant to shut up every vent and cranny, and keep out the air by sandbags and list and the like, until the rooms become oppressive, and their inmates get neuralgia by rushing into the other extreme. The desideratum is a well-ventilated house, properly warmed withal; one which, by its equable diffusion of agreeable warmth through all the passages and thoroughfares, and, from them, through all the living rooms, shall not make people "coddles" half so much as the ordinary houses in which they resort to screens, shawls, and foot-warmers, and get so chilly that they dare not go from one room into another, much less into the open air. The faults of most plans to obviate cold draughts and smoky chimneys are summarized in the first part of the first chapter. The best of them, the improvement by the French General Morin upon Captain Galton's plan, which consists in a proper adjustment of a fresh air flue around, and not as Captain Galton's plan provided, parallel with, the smoke flue, so as to constitute a pump, pumping into a room warmed fresh air in quantities proportioned to the warming power of the smoke flue, is shown to fail, in spite of its advantages of equable temperature, prevention of draughts, and economy of fuel, in consequence of its inapplicability to any but single rooms, and these with fires burning in them. There are many rooms in which fires are seldom lighted, and many bedrooms in which there are no fireplaces at all. The problem is to find a scheme embracing more rooms than the kitchen, which, on account of its constant fire, must be the starting-point of all successful

experiments if ventilation is to be attained by fire-suction, as it is generally confessed it must be.

We live at the bottom of an ocean of air pressing equally every way, any portion of which, on getting heated, expands in volume, becomes specifically lighter, and is pushed up by the fall of the colder, denser, and heavier air, which takes its place. Besides the aperture which the mere light of nature would almost suggest for the egress of this heated air, an ingress is needed for the equal volume of incoming colder air, or the passage will be in danger of getting choked by clashing currents in a small space. Watson's ventilators are the readiest attempts to meet this danger, but the authors consider that they do not really meet the need of houses, though they may do very well for outhouses, barns, foundries, and other large buildings, where the object is to have fresh air, and when it is either immaterial whether the air be cold, or else desirable that it should be so. The principle of these ventilators is spontaneous ventilation; but what our authors propose is self-acting ventilation,

the suction-power being gained not only by the warmth of air in the house, but by the intense heat of the kitchen fire, and the long warm syphon, which give such a powerful draught, that air sufficiently warmed can be drawn into and through the rooms, up the flues, through a foul air-chamber, and even down the downcast shaft, in opposition to gravity.

After illustrating the risks of spontaneous ventilation, one of which is that outer air demanding entrance, and shut out at its more natural doors, will be sucked in from sinks, cellars, drains, and cesspools, from all of which foul and dangerous gases are liable to be drawn in, the writers go on to provide against the prevention of waste of heat in the general passages and thoroughfares by the proper placing of doors that connect with the outer air, and by having a central hall separate from the stairs lobby, into which no outer door shall open. The back-door may open into a kitchen or scullery; the front into a lobby, to which the servant who answers the bell has an access distinct from that central hall which is commended in all house-building, as well for its many conveniences and enabling the sitting-rooms to be built *en suite*, as for its ventilating uses and purposes. In the plans of House 1 and House 2, which are given in an appendix to the volume before us, and which represent, the one a marine villa near Liverpool, the other a house in a street of that town, will be found illustrations of the uses to which this inner corridor may be put that will recommend themselves to all good house-builders. This inner corridor is best warmed by an open fireplace, and the pleasant and simple radiation of heat therefrom. Next to preserving the heat of this central hall, its passages and connected rooms, comes the question of warming the incoming air, and this is met by passing it over or through coils of hot-water pipes, so as to warm it up to sixty-five degrees. In House No. 1 this is done with large pipes and hot water on the low-pressure system, and in No. 2 with small pipes on the high-pressure system. The cure for the dryness of artificially warmed air, which is disagreeable and unhealthy, is to supply water either by evaporation or spray. The primary air-inlet is in the basement of the house through the wall; but a better plan, resulting in purer air, is to have a shaft down the wall from the level of the house-top, connecting by a flue with the secondary inlet opening into the central hall. In the passage between these two inlets much of the dust and dirt accompanying the air will settle, with considerable gain to the rooms and furniture from which they are so intercepted, and a canvas screen might make this arrangement more perfect. The warming apparatus should be at the basement of the central hall. The doors of all the rooms should open out of this hall, which is separate from the common thoroughfares, and kept permanently warm; but the next point is how to conduct the fresh warm air into the rooms. Our authors say by a special inlet through or below the base of the cornice, split up into numerous orifices, and through a slit, running along the whole length of the wall. This is better than through the skirting-board, which, as we scarcely need to be told, conducts cooler air direct to the feet of the inmates. There should be no other ingress. This one alone will provide due ventilation and warming, and supersede the necessity which is felt in ordinary houses of badly fitting doors and windows as a safety valve. The outlets for vitiated air from the rooms should be near the ceiling, and outlet and inlet should be nearly equal in size. A zinc tube from the central ornament over the gas, and at a distance from the inlet, should connect it with a flue in the brickwork of the inner wall, leading up to the foul-air chamber.

But the chief boast of the authors is to have reduced the costliness of the suction-power which is the gist of the whole matter, by finding in the kitchen chimney the sure and unfailing source of suction by fire-heat. No heat is by their plan withdrawn from the cooking or the boiler, the chimney being made long, the smoke flue of cast iron, the chimney throat contracted by having the close kitchen range, and the chimney contracted by a chimney-pot. Thus is avoided the loss of heat in common fireplaces by the passage of excess of air up the chimney, carrying off the heat. A foul-air chimney and common shaft are needed for the vitiated air, and to this end the kitchen chimney stack should be in the interior of the house, built straight up, broad and tall, and towering several feet above the other chimneys. By taking this shaft down and round the fire, the waste heat of the fire will be utilized. A recapitulation of the interdependent parts of the system of Messrs. Drysdale and Haywood is given in p. 41, which it may be well to quote for the sake of greater clearness. The first aim is

to prevent air from entering the house except by a specially provided inlet in the lowest story of the house, with conditions available for the warming,

\* *Health and Comfort in House-Building.* By J. Drysdale, M.D., and J. W. Haywood, M.D. London: Spon. 1872.



cleaning, disinfecting, and otherwise improving the quality of the incoming fresh air, and regulating its quantity; the fresh air is then conducted into the central private hall, protected from intrusion of servants, kitchen smells, and other means of pollution; from this private hall the rooms draw their supply, and that even when the doors are shut. Having served its purpose in the rooms, the air is drawn off through the ceiling up into the foul-air chamber, and thence down and behind the kitchen fire up the kitchen chimney-stack, and discharged high up in the open air; all possibility of back draught being prevented by the length and heat of the exhausting syphon.

This general principle has been applied by the writers with considerable skill to two very different houses, the one of but two stories with a large ground plan, the other a town street house of four stories, so that the conditions to be dealt with were very diverse. How success was achieved in each instance our readers may learn by studying a short second chapter along with the accompanying plans. Besides the authors' own assurance, we have the testimony of Dr. Inman, before quoted, that the first house (No. 1) was the happy mean in point of ventilation and warming—neither too hot nor too cold.

It is interesting to learn that the views of the authors were loyally carried out by their architects, who were not touchy about much necessary interference. It is suggested, however, that neither architects nor builders can be blamed for not spontaneously adopting sanitary improvements which, besides being costly, are not called for by the proprietors. Owners must be educated up to realizing the vital necessity for concurrent warming and ventilation; and the process will take a long time, though the writers look forward to the application of their plan to the poorest class of houses, on the principle of association, as in the case of water-supply, gas, and drainage, and, at an earlier day, to the offices of merchants, warehouses, manufactories, and public buildings. The question of cost is not so formidable, they urge, as it seems, because with proper ventilation neither sitting-rooms nor bedrooms need be so high by a foot as at present. Had we space we could astonish some of our readers by quoting their tilt against a venerable prejudice, shared by most of us, in favour of a good large, airy bedroom. We have no doubt that this useful treatise will give an impetus to the zeal for improvement of dwellings in these important particulars; though, in justice to Mr. Wheeler and his handy book about the "Choice of a Dwelling," we must observe that he has touched upon many of its recommendations in his chapter on Ventilation. As Dr. Drysdale and Dr. Hayward have lectured and written on the subject since 1868, he may have been more or less indebted to them for his data; but it is satisfactory to find that competent house-architects are in accord with these scientific house-improvers. We do not see that the question of reconstruction and adaptation of existing houses is anywhere sufficiently met in this volume to give much assistance to those who possess houses already in reforming their inward arrangements, unless they pull them down and build new ones. From this point of view those who have yet to build are to be, when all is done, congratulated. The great and serious difficulty, however, will be to find intelligent attendants to carry out the routine directions as to regulating the quantity and temperature of admitted air. In the simpler matter of Moule's patent earth-closets, it is astonishing how hard it is to get a servant to carry out directions. And, as the writers sadly suggest, even tenants and owners are chary of looking into things for themselves. A house too changes hands in time, and a new owner may not know, even if he cares, how to keep the house-warming system in train. Our authors advise "an indestructible tablet of explanation," and, no doubt, if the rules were written on brass on the walls of the central corridor, the end might be attained; but, after all, the best security will be the spread of popular interest in the subject.

#### WRAYFORD'S WARD.\*

AS no notice of previous publication accompanies these volumes, and as life is not long enough to read all the magazines which appear, we will accept *Wrayford's Ward* and its companions as new, not knowing that they are old. Whether old or new, there is sufficient merit in some of the stories to warrant serious notice, if others are too alight for either praise or blame. The capacity for writing a telling short story is very different from that required for a more sustained effort. The happy touch-and-go style which tells much in a single sentence and which suggests more than it details, the greater simplicity of material, and the more rigid attention which must be paid to the unities, give a good novelette or short story a certain concentration of interest which is wanting to the orthodox three volumes, save with first-rate writers. The reader's attention is not diverted by those irritating irrelevances which in the longer effort serve for padding; the action is not distorted and dragged simply to meet the exigencies of space. Everything comes in clean and clear; and yet with this more trim, because more compressed, method as much is unavoidably left to the imagination as is presented to the intellect.

Mr. Robinson is a good story-teller; and some of his tales are very well done. Perhaps the first, which gives its name to the book, is the best in a sense, having more of the interest of growth in it, though it gives a less true analysis of character than some others. Abel Wrayford, the grey-haired, studious, high-shouldered chemist, who was "Old Wrayford" before he was

seven-and-thirty, and who gave himself up to chemical "crazes" and unprofitable experiments in colours and torpedoes, is admirably drawn on the outside. But the human passion that asserted itself in him after "he had studied all his youth away" in that lonely "Nest" of his is perhaps more pathetic than natural. It seems scarcely likely that a man who had lived for so many years absorbed in scientific researches, and with his ward growing up like his own child about his knees, would at once abandon the father's place which had become one of habit, and fall into a passion of love as unjust as it was tyrannical, and as violent as it was unexpected. His other crazes, which ate into his income and brought him less profit than knowledge, were rational compared to this; and it seems to us that a thoughtful philosopher would have been able to subdue such an unsuitable passion, and would have compelled his senses to come once more under the dominion of reason. Nevertheless, the story is interesting, and the incidents are pointedly put and graphically narrated. At the risk of appearing hypercritical, however, we question the likelihood of Abel's threatened abduction by Bob Trustworth and his companion worthies, even with the convenient help of the Confederate boat bound to run the blockade of Charleston standing off the bar; also the statement that one of the men had been in prison for his share in wrecking a vessel by means of false lights reads like a bit of seaboard history of fifty or a hundred years ago. It is an anachronism at the present day, with Preventive Service men perambulating the coast through the night, and keeping a sharp look out on all that happens. Neither is there any purely local colour to mark the assigned place of the story. The scene is said to be laid on the Cornish coast; but it might be on the Welsh or Northumberland line, or any other place where a painter could figure a triad of desperadoes in tarpaulin-hats, with a boat waiting in the cove below and a blockade-runner in the offing. The diction is not West-country at all; and Cornwall has evidently been chosen only as suggestive of something wild and out of the reach of railroads and modern civilization. These, however, are technical blunders rather than serious faults, and do not touch the dramatic merits of the story.

"Jenny Merton" is a charming sketch. Its description of the tender, patient love of the snuffy old supernumerary for the bright little "fairy" of the boards is very pretty, though it repeats in a certain way the motif of *Abel Wrayford's Ward*. But here again the author seems to forget the day of which he writes, when he gives us the abduction, this time completed, of the pretty actress. This also, like the earlier instance, repeats one of the ideas of the first story, and reads as much like Lovelace and his era, and as little like the action of a modern Lord Boddles, however loose his morals and plentiful his spare cash, as the planned abduction of Abel Wrayford reads like the times of the pressgang, and not like the times of the Coastguard. We are glad that Mr. Robinson had the realistic courage to pass poor old Whitedrop on to the parish, where he certainly would have gone in real life, and that he did not make Jenny and her husband his self-constituted guardians and caretakers. It would have been very pretty if they had so rewarded his good services, but it would not have been real; and we are always thankful when we see an author brave enough to write of things as they are, and get his interest out of truth, rather than go for it to fancy and an impossible ideal.

Mr. Robinson is fond of the theme of concealed and unsuccessful love. It is the dominant chord of the present collection; for, out of the thirteen stories which make up the three volumes, five are based on this. We have already spoken of two; the three others are "Richard Arnott's Craze," "Achille," and "Widow Silvani." Of these the last is the most ambitious, as well as the most melodramatic. A villain who is bad enough to set fire to his house with the intention of burning his little son that he may profit by the boy's fortune, and a woman, beautiful and impassioned, who is noble enough to consent to evil appearances that she may frustrate her lover's black designs, offer a sufficient groundwork for any amount of melodramatic embroidery. Add to this the wearisomely persistent love of a man of the moon-calf genus, a poking, prying, irrepressible man, a man who sits and sighs and stares, and urges his suit again and again after he has been positively refused, who dogs his lady-love and suspects her, who would die for her if he had the chance and only succeeds in profoundly boring her, and we have material for a good story of his kind. The hero, or perhaps we should say the autobiographer, of "Widow Silvani," Arthur Hartmore, is by no means an engaging person. He pleads for himself in his description of his intense love and devotion to the beautiful Italian woman seven years his senior, but we can see him as he must have appeared to her; and the portrait is not bewitching. The weak spot, too, in his moral nature—namely, his want of loyal tenacity of faith in the woman he loves, which makes him waver and suspect and spy—is rendered more hateful by his very persistency of devotion; but the character is unfortunately all the more lifelike because of its very departure from a high ideal; and in this, as in the ultimate fate of poor old snuff-taking Whitedrop, Mr. Robinson shows himself good as an artist in proportion to his courage in facing the unlovely reality of the life he delineates.

"Nantle Ferry" and "Friend Karl" are also melodramatic; the latter especially so, adding as it does the element of supernatural horror to that of human tragedy. But the author does not succeed so well in melodrama as in quiet every-day life. His blue fire is too evidently burnt for effect; it does not seem to belong to the scene, or to be brought there by superior influ-

\* *Wrayford's Ward, and other Tales.* By F. W. Robinson, Author of "Grandmother's Money," &c. 3 vols. London: Hurst & Blackett. 1872.

ences. It is of the stage, stagy; we know that the carpenter has a hand in it, and that it is only a very commonplace ingredient after all, when we come to examine into it; that all its horror is make-believe, and that the unearthly visitant who is supposed to make our flesh creep is nothing but a super wrapped in a sheet, while the men at the wings manage the coloured glasses or the chemicals according to directions. "Friend Karl," however, is not bad for the kind of thing it is, and the vagueness of the conclusion is artistic. We like "Nantle Ferry" less, because its mystery or supernaturalism, if we may call it so, is more defined. The more clearly a mystery is expressed the less effect it has on the imagination, and the more the reader is disposed to examine it by the stricter tests of common sense and reason, when of course it loses its mysterious qualities, and comes out nonsense. Very few writers can handle melodrama successfully, and still fewer supernaturalism. The one inevitably suggests the police, with the question, "Where were they?" The other, as we said, smacks of the stage, with chemical and mechanical appliances made to order. The social possibilities of the one ought to be without strain or flaw; the phenomena of the other should not violate the order of natural laws, or shock one's common-sense experience. They ought merely to add that something beyond, which imagination supplies; and, above all things, care ought to be taken that this something which imagination creates should not be susceptible of ridicule.

There are two other stories in this collection which strike us as being good each in its own way. "Burles: a Bad Boy" is a capital sketch of a turbulent but not ungenerous spirit, though we incline more to Master Wilks, who shows a higher nature than even his friend and fellow-rebel Burles. The portrait of Mr. Maxon, the Master of the "Free School for the Children of Decayed London Shopkeepers," "iron-headed, hard-fisted, strong-featured," who was "partial to work" and never let his hundred and twenty scholars out of his sight, is excellently done. It is not exaggerated, and it is clear and strong. It might have been elaborated into a character as effective as that of Mr. Squeers, and made perhaps even a truer portrait than his. The other story, "An Odd Fix," is one of simple fun, and is excellent for what it assumes to be—a mere joke built up of slight materials. On the whole, Mr. Robinson's collection of stories takes good rank for work of its kind. It is not work of the best kind, but it comes in among others as a diversion and relief. It fills up the chance half-hours for which the three-volume novel is too lengthy; and it satisfies within a reasonable limit such interest as it has raised.

#### GERMAN LITERATURE.

THE appetite of authors for praise should be moderated by the reflection that not only will the indiscriminate encomiums of contemporaries be inexorably deducted from the sum of their reputation, but that, in so far as they have been overrated during their lives, they will be underrated after their deaths, until the equilibrium between reward and desert is perfectly established. The same purgatory of reactionary sentiment in which Byron has been imprisoned for nearly half a century, and which assuredly awaits most of the celebrities of our appreciative age, gapes as widely for men of science as for men of letters. If we do not greatly err, the elaborate memoir which has demanded the combined efforts of eleven biographers to describe Humboldt\* affords conclusive evidence of the decline of his colossal, but to a certain extent conventional, reputation. At first sight this application of the co-operative system to biography appears a favourable symptom; it is natural to attribute the multitude of the workmen to the magnitude of the work, and compare the latter with the rock in the Iliad:—

Ten degenerate men of modern days  
The enormous weight from earth could hardly raise.

But we soon discover that this division of labour is less the measure of the difficulty of the task than of the indifference of those engaged in it; that the work is a partnership *en commandite*, in which nobody has cared to venture very much. It is by no means an uninteresting book, and may even be pronounced indispensable. The scientific men engaged upon it are authorities of first-rate eminence, whose judgments may be fully relied upon. Just, however, because they are specialists engaged in judging a man of universal attainments, their investigations acquire a character of minuteness which the subject of them is ill fitted to sustain. They inevitably prescribe a standard to which he never intended to conform. Each is willing to give Humboldt the highest credit in every department of knowledge except that with which he happens to be especially conversant himself; therein he is pronounced superficial, and a little antiquated besides. As, however, this particular department always happens to be the very one under review, Humboldt's fame fares among the men of science like the pig among the Mahometans. Everybody would be shocked at the idea of devouring him *en masse*, but everybody has got his own peculiar morsel with which he thinks it no harm to make free. It must, on the other hand, be admitted that, if Humboldt is scarcely treated with fairness in this respect, there

are sides on which his renown is really vulnerable. His contemporaries overlooked a fact insisted on here, that he was not after all a discoverer so much as a collector. He added innumerable facts to the domain of knowledge, but scarcely a single principle to the domain of thought. He also chose to rest much of his fame on a systematization of the science of his time; an important work, indeed, but not capable of achieving or conferring immortality, inasmuch as the progress of discovery must render it obsolete. It thus appears undeniable that he must drop into the second rank, and that the contemporary judgment which paralleled him with Aristotle imperatively requires revision. This conviction, though not distinctly formulated, has evidently impressed the scientific men who have here undertaken to summarize and report upon his labours. Its influence is traceable in a general languor of execution and temperance of appreciation, imperfectly relieved by complimentary adjectives which have all the effect of titles of ceremony. In a strictly scientific aspect, however, this review leaves little to be desired, and it is certainly the most valuable part of the work. It consists of eight essays by as many separate writers on Humboldt's achievements in as many departments of science, and forms an appendix to the biography, which occupies two volumes, and has employed three authors. Though dry, and executed in the spirit of task-work, it is tolerable, with the exception of the last section, which unfortunately involves a general verdict upon Humboldt's character as a man no less than as a philosopher. The writer of this portion of the work is incompetent as well as unfriendly. The noble spectacle of old age devoted to the disinterested pursuit of science, and retaining unimpaired the generous sentiments of youth, appears altogether lost upon him; nor does he seem able to appreciate the many testimonies of munificence, magnanimity, and affection which it has fallen to his own lot to record.

The first Emperor of Austria belongs to the numerous class of sovereigns who are rather remembered for the important transactions of their reigns than for their own participation in them. The place of such monarchs in history is necessarily disproportioned to their personal qualities; indeed, the precise nature of these is often to a great degree conjectural. It is the purpose of Dr. Hermann Meynert\* to inform us at last what manner of man the Emperor Francis really was, and incidentally to establish his claim to be regarded as no merely nominal ruler, but one who made the influence of his will felt in every department of the State. By the help of masses of unpublished documents, chiefly written or dictated by the Emperor himself, he does certainly succeed in demonstrating that Francis was anything but a *roi fainéant*. His vigilance must have been unsleeping, his industry indefatigable, his attention to details would have been admirable if such anxious consideration of minutiae ranked among the merits of a sovereign. But this very precision was but the token of a narrow mind, incapable of comprehending general principles, and busying itself with the minor accidents of administration which to its conception represented the whole system of government. A fair idea of the Emperor's character may be conveyed by a comparison with George III., whom he greatly resembled in his passion for business, his addiction to routine, his instinct for political management and ignorance of political science, his intuitive appreciation of ordinary men and his inability to understand extraordinary ones, his obstinacy, and his cunning; nor less in the simplicity of his manners and general purity of his life. Although, however, Dr. Meynert's work will not contribute to exalt the Emperor's reputation for any other endowment than drudging diligence, it is a valuable repository of information respecting the administration of Austria during his long reign. It is divided into twenty-seven chapters, most of which are severally devoted to some particular department of government, either concerning an individual province or affecting the whole Empire. The chapters relating to the various nationalities are the most interesting, from the light they cast upon the especial difficulties which still beset the Austrian Empire. In general, notwithstanding the courtly style of the many-medalled historian, the impression conveyed is unfavourable. The prevailing maxim of Austrian statesmanship seems to have been that all initiative must proceed from the Government; the trifling progress achieved is consequently not the measure of the capacities of the thirty millions of Austrians, but of those of a bureaucracy receiving no impulse from a mind of original power, but obeying the traditions of a monotonous routine with servile exactitude.

Agessilaus is a much more interesting subject for biography than the Emperor Francis, but the facts of his life are too well ascertained to leave much scope for the historian. Professor Buttmann†, however, considers that the author of the principal biography hitherto extant in German has kept too close an eye upon the politics of Germany, and that there is thus room for a more impartial work. His own concise, yet full, memoir is mainly based on the authority of Xenophon, which is as much to say that it is highly favourable, not only to Agessilaus, but to Spartan policy in general.

Max Krenkel's monograph on the Apostle John‡ is a counter-

\* *Alexander von Humboldt. Eine wissenschaftliche Biographie.* In Verein mit R. Avé-Lallemant, J. V. Carus, A. Dove, H. W. Dove, J. W. Ewald, A. H. R. Grisebach, J. Löwenberg, O. Peschel, G. H. Wiedemann, W. Wundt, bearbeitet, und herausgegeben von K. Bruhns. 3 Bde. Leipzig: Brockhaus. London: Williams & Norgate.

\* *Kaiser Franz I. Zur Geschichte seiner Regierung und seiner Zeit.* Von Dr. Hermann Meynert. Wien: Hölder. London: Asher & Co.

† *Agessilaus. Lebensbild eines spartanischen Königs und Patrioten.* Von A. Buttmann. Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses. London: Williams & Norgate.

‡ *Der Apostel Johannes.* Von Max Krenkel. Berlin: Hensel. London: Nutt.



part to his former work on St. Paul, and is distinguished, like the latter, for attractive style, strong sense, and the gift of presenting the results of erudite research in a popular form. Its inferiority in interest arises from the nature of the subject, and from the concessions as to the apostle's personality and career imposed upon the author by the exigencies of modern criticism. Few German authorities now feel warranted in attributing the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel to the same writer; and whether the Seer makes way for the Evangelist, or *vice versa*, the picturesqueness of the traditional portrait is equally impaired. Krenkel determining the point in favour of the Apocalypse, his task is in a great measure confined to an exposition of that work. He assigns the date of composition to the reign of Galba, which seems to be regarded by most modern commentators as a necessary inference from the indisputable identification of the wounded head of the Beast with the Emperor Nero. We venture to suggest that the short reign of Galba hardly affords time for the growth of a Neronian myth; that the Seer may well have disregarded the ephemeral reigns of this sovereign and his next two successors; and that the passage (xi. 1, 2) adduced to prove that the Temple was still in existence at the date of the vision is insufficient to establish this conclusion. Krenkel ably defends the tradition of John's residence at Ephesus against the scepticism of Keim and others; endeavours, not very successfully, to establish the identity of the "elder" mentioned by Papias with the apostle; and propounds the novel, ingenious, and improbable conjecture that the False Prophet of the Apocalypse embodies an allusion to the adulatory predictions of Vespasian's greatness made by Josephus.

Dr. August Wünsche's commentary on Joel\* is distinguished by a free employment of Rabbinical authorities, and by a preliminary essay in which the date of the prophecies is assigned to the reign of Joash.

Professor Kozioł's minute and exhaustive dissection of the style of Apuleius† aims at a separate exhibition of the numerous peculiarities which, taken in their totality, constitute the phenomenon of "African Latin."

The collection of Dr. H. Ethé's miscellaneous writings‡ is wanting in unity, and might with advantage have been distributed between two volumes. The first section contains sensible but not very striking essays on literary subjects, including reviews of some of the less known German poets and novelists of the day, of Wagner as a dramatist, and of the Emperor Maximilian's writings. In the latter or specifically Oriental section we have, among other matter, a legend of the supernatural founded on an incident frequently occurring in the *Arabian Nights*; and a notice of the last prophet of the East, the unfortunate Báb. Dr. Ethé adds nothing to the story as told by Count Gobineau, but it is one that can hardly be told too often, both for its romantic interest and as a testimony of the indomitable reaction of the Persian mind, rich in Aryan fancy and feeling, against the monotonous creed imposed upon it by the Arabian conqueror.

The object of Herr Scheube's work§ on German culture in Alsace is to convince the Alsatians (of the Lorrainers he prudently says nothing) that they are excellent Germans if they would but see it. The proposition is enforced by the biographies of a number of eminent persons, from Pope Leo IX. and Gottfried of Strassburg down to Oberlin, in whom the qualifications of Alsatian and German were indubitably combined. It is well written and interesting, but most of the personages are so quaint and mediæval, so utterly estranged from modern ideas and sympathies, that we should fear the exhibition of them as examples of the Teutonic spirit would be better calculated to affright than to allure a lively people whose traditions date from 1789, and who would rather pass for anything than old-fashioned.

Dr. P. C. Planta||, a member of a family for nearly three centuries intimately connected with the history of the Grisons, has produced a work of great compass and learning on the antiquities of Rætia. The period comprised extends from the earliest ages to the cessation of the Saxon line of the Emperors of Germany, and involves the discussion of many points of great interest, especially those connected with the dissolution of the Roman Empire. The most generally attractive portion, however, is that relating to the organization of the Roman province of Rætia, which comprised not only the Northern districts of Switzerland, but a large portion of Bavaria and the Tyrol. The picture thus presented of the administration of a Roman province is highly interesting.

The exploration of the Antarctic continent has been at a standstill for twenty-seven years. Dr. G. Neumayer¶ recalls attention to this interesting subject by a brief but comprehensive survey of what has been accomplished, and a proposal for the renewal of operations. He recommends the Cape of Good Hope as the point of departure, and that the route followed should be that of Captain Moore, the last explorer. The value of his little treatise is

enhanced by a bibliography of all voyages and memoirs relating to the subject.

Dr. Wigand\* seems inclined to account for the origin of species in organic nature as Leibnitz accounted for original sin, by the hypothesis of germs connate with the first individual, which remain dormant for generations, and suddenly develop themselves when least expected. His essay is chiefly significant as an example of the prevailing desire to supplement the theory of natural selection by the demonstration of kindred agencies, and to substitute the conception of harmonious evolution, the external expression of a principle working from within, for that of creation by chance medley, with which the hypothesis, by however perverse an interpretation, frequently impresses minds trained solely in physical science.

We have to record the completion of C. Radenhausen's remarkable work, *Isis*.† The last volume deals chiefly with scientific and political questions habitually discussed by the press, and is consequently less striking and interesting than the earlier volumes, with their broad generalizations in the domains of theology and speculative philosophy. We observe with surprise that the *Vestiges of Creation* are unhesitatingly attributed to an unheard-of "Kemp," of whose authorship it would be difficult to find "vestiges" anywhere else.

Whatever new lives of Raffaele may be written, and whatever diligence and acuteness may be expended upon them, Vasari's‡ will always remain the classical biography—the foundation of the rest. Hermann Grimm, already favourably known in this department of biography by his life of Michael Angelo, has recognized this fact by undertaking a fresh translation of Vasari, with which the results of modern research are incorporated in the form of an ample commentary. This additional information is skilfully combined, and affords fully as agreeable reading as the original text. The value of the work is enhanced by an excellent introduction, treating of the phases through which Raffaele's reputation has passed since his death, the manner in which he has been apprehended by various nations and dissimilar schools of art and thought, and the contributions which have been made to his biography. We are glad to see the services rendered by England to the study and fame of Raffaele warmly appreciated by the author. The work will be completed in a second volume; the present comes down to the completion of the "School of Athens."

Professor Vischer§ prefaces his oration on the influence of war on the arts by the explanation of his having been induced to overcome his antipathy to the publication of oral discourses in consequence of a severe attack of hoarseness having rendered his speech all but inaudible. The loss of the audience has proved the gain of the reading public; for although the subject has not elicited, and probably hardly allowed, any striking originality of treatment, its connexion with the recent history of the speaker's country leads up to a peroration of impassioned eloquence, classical in form, and inspired by the loftiest elevation of sentiment.

*Wilhelm Wolschuld*|| is, for Germany, an exceptionally good novel; exceptional also in the place of publication and the condition of society depicted. The scene is laid in Courland, and the object is in part the representation of a state of society now passing away. The moral, for obvious reasons rather implied than expressed, is apparently the need for assimilating Courland to Germany by cultivating Teutonic rather than Lettish or Slavonic affinities and ideas. This general design is connected with a tragical love story of considerable interest. The descriptions of scenes and personages are frequently very vivid; the chief defect of the book is its occasional prolixity.

"The Bride of Rörvig,"¶ from the Danish of W. Bergsøe, is a nautical story, chiefly turning on the superstitions of seamen and fishermen. The collection of novelettes edited by Paul Heyse and H. Kurz\*\* continues to advance. The last volume contains three very good stories by M. Reich, M. Meyr, and T. Storm.

The Tauchnitz collection of English classics has been enriched by a selection from Shelley's writings††, edited by Miss Mathilde Blind. The selection is made with excellent taste, and is introduced by a memoir of the poet, condensed with much ability from the best sources of information, eloquent in point of diction and discriminating in point of criticism.

A collection of Robert Hamerling's minor poems‡‡ affords a fair view of the merits and defects of one of the few recent

\* *Die Weissagungen des Propheten Joel*. Uebersetzt und erklärt von Dr. A. Wünsche. Leipzig: Fues. London: Asher & Co.

† *Der Stil des L. Apuleius*. Von H. Kozioł. Wien: Gerold's Sohn. London: Asher & Co.

‡ *Essays und Studien*. Von Dr. Hermann Ethé. Berlin: Nicolai. London: Asher & Co.

§ *Deutscher Geist und deutsche Art im Elsass*. Von H. Scheube. Berlin: Berggold. London: Williams & Norgate.

|| *Das alte Rætien staatlich und kultur-historisch dargestellt*. Von Dr. P. C. Planta. Berlin: Weidmann. London: Asher & Co.

¶ *Die Erforschung des Süd-Polar Gebiets*. Von Dr. G. Neumayer. Berlin: Reimer. London: Williams & Norgate.

\* *Die Genealogie der Urzellen als Lösung des Descendenz-Problems*. Von Dr. A. Wigand. Braunschweig: Vieweg. London: Williams & Norgate.

† *Isis. Der Mensch und die Welt*. Von C. Radenhausen. Bd. 4. Braunschweig: Vieweg. London: Nutt.

‡ *Das Leben Raphaels von Urbino*. Italienischer Text von Vasari, Uebersetzung und Commentar von H. Grimm. Th. 1. Berlin: Dümmler. London: Williams & Norgate.

§ *Der Krieg und die Künste*. Vortrag von Friedrich Vischer. Stuttgart: Weise. London: Williams & Norgate.

|| *Wilhelm Wolschuld. Ein Roman aus dem Baltischen Leben*. Von Theodor Hermann. Mitau: Behre. London: Williams & Norgate.

¶ *Die Braut von Rörvig*. Erzählung von W. Bergsøe, frei bearbeitet von Adolf Strodthmann. Berlin: Janke. London: Williams & Norgate.

\*\* *Deutscher Novellen-Schatz*. Serie 2, Bd. 3. München: Oldenbourg. London: Williams & Norgate.

†† *A Selection from the Poems of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. Edited, with a Memoir, by Mathilde Blind. Leipzig: Tauchnitz. London: Williams & Norgate.

‡‡ *Gesammelte kleinere Dichtungen*. Von Robert Hamerling. Hamburg: Richter. London: Williams & Norgate.

German poets who have established a reputation. Colour and music rank chief among the author's merits; his chief defect is the poverty of thought frequently associated with extreme facility of expression.

A new literary journal \*—or rather an old one resuscitated after lying dormant for thirteen years—is designed to fill the place once occupied in this country by the *Retrospective Review*. The first numbers of the new series contain a number of excellent papers of very miscellaneous character, but all illustrative of the literary and artistic culture of Germany in times past.

\* *Zeitschrift für deutsche Kulturgeschichte*. Neue Folge. Herausgegeben von Dr. J. H. Müller. Hannover: Meyer. London: Williams & Norgate.

#### NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

The SATURDAY REVIEW is duly registered for transmission abroad.

The publication of the SATURDAY REVIEW takes place on Saturday Mornings, in time for the early trains, and copies may be obtained in the Country, through any Newsagent, on the day of publication.

## THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF No. 882, SEPTEMBER 21, 1872:

The Award. The West Prussian Centenary.  
Politics in September. The St. Bartholomew Controversy.  
The Proposed Commercial Treaty. The Attorney-General on Law Reform.  
Vote by Ballot at Preston. Religious Reaction in France.

Credulity. The Geographical Society and Lieutenant Dawson.

Lorsch. Anglicans and Old Catholics. The Railways and the Public.  
Fallacies of Teetotalism. Priests in Courts of Law.  
A Retrospect of the Autumn Manœuvres.

Fayer's Venomous Snakes of India.  
More School Histories. Cobbe's Memorials of Twickenham. Cardinal de Retz.  
Lamon's Life of Abraham Lincoln. Health and Comfort in House-Building.  
Wayford's Ward. German Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

## ADVERTISEMENTS.

### CRYSTAL PALACE.—SATURDAY CONCERTS and AFTERNOON PROMENADES, 1872-3.

The Seventeenth Series will commence on October 5. There will be Twenty-five CONCERTS in all, on the following dates:

1872—October 5, 12, 19, 26.  
1872—November 2, 9, 16, 23, 30.  
1872—December 7, 14.  
1872—January 19, 26.

Conductor.—Mr. MANNS. Transferable Reserved Stall for the Twenty-five Concerts, 5 Guineas; Stall for a Single Concert, Half-a-Crown.

The Band and Chorus will be of the same strength as during last season. Every effort will be made to give variety and novelty to the programme without forsaking the general principles which have regulated those of former years; while no pains will be spared to maintain the high standard of execution to which these Concerts are indebted for their reputation.

The Nine Symphonies of Beethoven will be again performed in chronological order; Symphonies by Haydn, Mozart, Schubert, Mendelssohn, Schumann, Spohr; the Serenade in D by Brahms, &c. Among the works to be produced for the first time at these Concerts are Symphonies in E flat by Mozart (1773), and in B flat by Schubert (MS.), and a new MS. work for Orchestra from the pen of Sir W. Sterndale Bennett, composed expressly for the Crystal Palace.

The Choral Works will include St. Paul, Mendelssohn; Paradise and the Peri, Schumann; the May Queen, W. Sterndale Bennett; Te Deum, Sullivan, &c.  
Among the Solo Instrumental Works will be found Concerto in B flat, Mozart (his last); Rondo in B flat, Beethoven (posthumous); Concerto in D, Rubinstein—all for the first time at these Concerts.

The most eminent Solo Artists attainable, both Instrumental and Vocal, will be engaged.

Mr. Manns's Benefit Concert will take place on April 26.

At the Afternoon Promenades the Exhibition of Objects of Interest in Art and Manufacture will be continued, as opportunity may offer.

Crystal Palace: September, 1872.

By Order, G. GROVE, Secretary.

MR. and MRS. GERMAN REED'S ENTERTAINMENT  
RE-OPENS Tuesday Evening, October 1.—MY AUNT'S SECRET (by numerous requests). FIVE O'CLOCK TEA, and CHARITY BEGINS AT HOME.—Royal Gallery of Illustration, 14 Regent Street.

DORÉ'S GREAT PICTURE of "CHRIST LEAVING the PRÆTORIUM," with "Triumph of Christianity," "Christian Martyrs," "Francesca da Rimini," "Neophyte," "Titania," &c., at the DORE GALLERY, 35 New Bond Street. Ten to Six. Admission, 1s.

ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S HOSPITAL and COLLEGE.—The WINTER SESSION will commence on Tuesday, October 1. Students can reside within the Hospital walls, subject to the College regulations. For all particulars concerning either the Hospital or College application may be made, personally or by letter, to the RESIDENT WARDEN of the College, or at the Museum or Library. A Handbook will be forwarded on application.

KING'S COLLEGE, London.—The Rev. ALEX. J. D. DORSEY, B.D., Lecturer on Eloquence in the Theological Department, receives PUPILS at Lectures, in Classes, and Privately at his house, 13 Prince's Square, W., to which all letters should be addressed.

WOOLWICH, COOPER'S HILL, LINE, and INDIAN CIVIL.—Rev. Dr. HUGHES (Wrang. Cam.), assisted by a Classical Medallist and other Tutors, prepares TWELVE PUPILS. Has passed over 300.—Ealing, W.

CIVIL ENGINEERING COLLEGE.—Mr. J. ASHTON, M.A. (Fifth Wrangler), and Assistant-Examiner in the University of London, prepares CANDIDATES for the above. At the recent Examination nine of his Pupils were successful. Among them were the First and Third in the list, the First and Third in Mathematics, the First in French, and the First in German.—41 King Henry's Road, South Hampstead.

## ROYAL SCHOOL of MINES.

DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE AND ART.

During the Twenty-second Session, 1872-73, which will commence on October 1, the following COURSES OF LECTURES and PRACTICAL DEMONSTRATIONS will be given:

1. Chemistry.—By E. Frankland, Ph.D., F.R.S.
2. Metallurgy.—By John Percy, M.D., F.R.S.
3. Natural History.—By T. H. Huxley, LL.D., F.R.S.
4. Mineralogy.—By Warrington W. Smyth, M.A., F.R.S., Chairman.
5. Mining.—By A. C. Ramsay, LL.D., F.R.S.
6. Geology.—By T. M. Goodeve, M.A.
7. Applied Mechanics.—By T. M. Goodeve, M.A.
8. Physics.—By Frederick Guthrie, Ph.D., F.R.S.
9. Mechanical Drawing.—By Rev. J. H. Edgar, M.A.

The Fee for Students desirous of becoming Associates is £30 in one sum, on entrance, or two Annual Payments of £20, exclusive of the Laboratories.

Pupils are received in the Chemical Laboratory, under the direction of Dr. Frankland, and in the Metallurgical Laboratory, under the direction of Dr. Percy. These Laboratories will be re-opened on October 1.

Tickets to separate Courses of Lectures are issued at 2s and 4s each.

Officers in the Queen's Service, Her Majesty's Consuls, Acting Mining Agents and Managers, may obtain Tickets at reduced prices.

Science Teachers are also admitted to the Lectures at reduced fees.

His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales grants Two Scholarships, and several others have also been established by Government.

For a Prospectus and information apply to the Registrar, Royal School of Mines, Jernyn Street, London, S.W.

TRENHAM REEKS, Registrar.

NOTE.—By order of the Lords of the Committee of Council on Education, the Instruction in Chemistry, Physics, and Natural History, will be given in the New Buildings, in the Exhibition Road, South Kensington.

## LEAMINGTON COLLEGE.

Visitor.—THE LORD BISHOP OF WORCESTER.

This College is founded to supply a liberal Education in accordance with the views of the Church of England.

Head-Master.—The Rev. JOSEPH WOOD, M.A., late Fellow of St. John's and Exhibitor of Balliol College, Oxford.

The College RE-OPENS on Wednesday, September 18th. Boarders must be at the College on the Evening of Tuesday the 17th. Further information may be obtained from the Head-Master.

MR. A. DAWSON CLARKE (B.A. Cambridge) and Mr. A. M. LIPSCOMB (B.A. Oxon) receive RESIDENT and NON-RESIDENT PUPILS for the various Competitive Examinations, and for the Universities. During the last three years Pupils have been prepared for the following Examinations: Oxford, Cambridge, and London Universities; Indian Telegraph Service. Civil Engineering College, and Wooded Forests; Woolwich, Direct Commission and Staff College; Diplomatic Service, British Museum, Preliminary Law and Medicine.—For Terms, References apply to Mr. A. D. CLARKE, 30 Torrington Square, W.C.; or to Mr. A. M. LIPSCOMB, 33 Bernard Street, Russell Square, W.C.—A Special Class for the Entrance Examination to Cooper's Hill College.

OXFORD MATRICULATION.—An OXFORD M.A., resident near Oxford, receives into his Rectory a few PUPILS to prepare for Matriculation. Satisfactory references.—Address, Rev. A. W., Christ Church, Oxford.

EXAMINATIONS.—A GRADUATE (B.A. with Honours, and LL.B. London) READS with CANDIDATES for Matriculation, Preliminary Medical and Legal, and Civil Service Examinations, in Class or Privately. Resident Pupils received.—Address, Rev. LL.B., 35 Conduit Street, Hanover Square, W.

COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS.—BOYS, Sons of Gentlemen, from Twelve years of age, thoroughly prepared by Graduates of many years' experience. Terms, 40 Guineas, inclusive.—D.C.L., Mr. Barry, Chemist, Ealing, W.

PRIVATE TUITION.—SEASIDE.—A GENTLEMAN of very great experience receives about SIX PUPILS (Sons of Noblemen and Gentlemen only). A backward lad would have great individual care and attention. Preparation for the Army, Civil Service, or other Examinations. Resident Professor for conversational French and German. Terms, 80 and 100 Guineas inclusive.—Address, ZETA, Heme Lodge, Worthing.

FOLKESTONE.—Mr. W. J. JEAFFRESON, M.A. Oxon (formerly Principal of the Elphinstone High School, Bombay), will continue, with the Assistance of a Cambridge Honour-Man, to prepare PUPILS for the Universities, Indian Civil Service, Woolwich, and all Competitive Examinations.—Terms and References on application.

CIVIL ENGINEERING COLLEGE.—MORGAN JENKINS, M.A. (Wrangler), assisted by an able Staff, prepares CANDIDATES for the above. Three out of Four Pupils sent in for the last Examination passed.—50 Cornhill Road, Westbourne Park.

A MARRIED LADY, residing in the Country, is desirous of receiving FOUR CHILDREN to BOARD and EDUCATE. Very real advantages are offered, both as regards health, mental and intellectual training. There is a small farm attached to the House, and a Carriage kept. Terms, 50 Guineas per annum. Address, ALPHA, Post-Office, Marlborough.

PAINTING and SKETCHING.—PRIVATE or CLASS LESSONS given in OIL or WATER-COLOUR PAINTING, and Sketching from Nature, by an experienced Teacher. Schools attended on moderate terms.—Address, G. W., care of Mr. G. Street, 30 Cornhill.

A SOLICITOR wishes an appointment as RECEIVER and LAW AGENT to an Estate Owner, or to represent a Public Company, Society, &c. He has had long experience in all Conveyancing and Commercial Law details; also in managing Properties, Land, Houses, and Tenants, and can address audiences. Any locality. Has a competency, and is very energetic.—Address, DELTA, Post Office, Hollywood Road, West Brompton, S.W.

A GENTLEMAN, Travelled, a Linguist, with a practical experience of business matters, would be glad to act as PRIVATE SECRETARY to a Nobleman or Gentleman.—Address, F.R.S., Esq., care of Messrs. Parke & Pollack, 55 Leicester Inn Fields, London.

A GERMAN, by birth a Lady, desires an ENGAGEMENT in a good English Family for a year. She speaks the best German.—Address, FRANKLIN ANNA, 111 Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square, London, W.

APARTMENTS.—To GENTLEMEN seeking comfortable Rooms in a respectable and private Residence, near a Station on the Metropolitan Railway, in the W. district.—Application to be made to Mr. DEAR, 39 Southampton Street, Strand.

HYDROPATHY.—SUDBROOK PARK, Richmond Hill. Physician.—Dr. EDWARD LANE, M.A., M.D. Edin. Turkish Baths on the Premises. Private entrance into Richmond Park. Prospectus on application.

OVERLAND ROUTE.—THE PENINSULAR and ORIENTAL STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY BOOK PASSENGERS and receive Cargo and Parcels by their Steamers for

	FROM SOUTHAMPTON.	FROM VENICE (calling at Ancona).	FROM BRINDISI.
GIBRALTAR .....	Every Thursday, at 2 p.m.	—	—
MALTA .....	—	—	—
ALEXANDRIA .....	Every Thursday, at 2 p.m.	Every Friday, at noon.	Every Monday, at 5 a.m.
ADEN .....	—	—	—
BOMBAY .....	—	—	—
MADRAS .....	—	—	—
GALLE .....	—	—	—
CALCUTTA .....	Thursday, Sept. 12 and 26, at 2 p.m.	Friday, Sept. 6, 20, and Oct. 4, at noon.	Monday, Sept. 9, 23, and Oct. 7, at 5 a.m.
PENANG .....	—	—	—
SINGAPORE .....	—	—	—
CHINA .....	—	—	—
JAPAN .....	—	—	—
AUSTRALIA .....	—	—	—
NEW ZEALAND .....	Thursday, Sept. 26, at 2 p.m.	Friday, Oct. 4, at noon.	Monday, Oct. 7, at 5 a.m.

And all Ports at which the British India Company's Steamers call. An abatement of 20 per cent. from the charge for the Return Voyage is made to Passengers who have paid full fare to or from Ports Eastward of Suez re-embarking within Six Months of their arrival, and 10 per cent. to those re-embarking within Twelve Months.

Through Tickets to Brindisi can be obtained of LEBEAU & Co., 6 Billiter Street, E.C. (South Italian Railway Office).

For Rates of Passage Money and Freight, and all other information, apply at the Company's Office, 122 Leadenhall Street, London, or Oriental Place, Southampton.

OVERLAND PARCELS CONVEYANCE.—HENRY S. KING & CO., 65 Cornhill, London, make up despatches by every P. & O. Co.'s Steamer to India, China, and Australia. Tariff of charges on application.

A COLLIERY, ready to go to work, capable of raising about 70,000 Tons of Coal per annum, now worth 17s. to 18s. at the Pit, at a cost of 7s. 6d. per ton.—REQUIRED, One or Two PARTNERS, to find £10,000 to £15,000 to complete the purchase. References required and given before negotiating.—Address, S. G., care of J. Jeffery, Stationer, 7 George Yard, Lombard Street.